

PRO-ANGELOLOGY IN THE UGARITIC TEXTS AND
THE HEBREW BIBLE : A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF
THE NATURE AND ROLES OF LESSER DEITIES

BY

SANG YOUL CHO

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE SCHOOL OF DIVINITY

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND

2007

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

The present study aims to investigate whether or not there are affinities between the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible with regard to the nature and roles of divine beings ranked as lesser deities.

The first chapter investigates that the Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew texts contain evidence of polytheistic backgrounds of the divine assembly, which entails that it consists hierarchically of the higher deities and other lesser deities who are associated with these higher deities.

The second chapter examines that the lesser deities in the Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew texts are understood as having a kinship relation to their master god(dess).

The third chapter scrutinises that whilst diverse titles are employed to indicate the divine messengers in the Ugaritic texts, they are simply expressed as מלאך (מלאכים) in the Hebrew Bible, which is also attested in the Ugaritic texts.

The fourth chapter observes that whilst the lesser deities appear as the warrior deities with a diversity of titles in the context of the divine warfare in the Ugaritic texts, the lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible are represented also as warrior deities through various titles.

The last chapter arranges the miscellaneous roles of the lesser deities into the categories of mediator deities, guardian deities, chanter deities, and servant deities represented in both Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew descriptions.

Through the striking parallels displayed between the lesser deities of the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible, this research concludes that the Hebrew religious tradition has shared the same theological conceptions as Ugaritic religion.

*To my parents, Ki Hung Cho and Do Sun Yoon, and to my wife, Jeong Min Yeo
for their support and encouragement
and above all
for their love*

DECLARATION

This dissertation is in fulfilment of the requirements established by the University of Edinburgh, for the degree of Doctor of Philology in Hebrew and Old Testament Studies. The composition is entirely my own work, and all contributions from other authors have been clearly indicated.

Sang Youl Cho

- 9 MAY 2007

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It was during the spring of 2002 when I was enrolled in the course "Ugaritic" taught by Mr. Meredith M. Kline at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary that stories of divine messengers in the Ugaritic texts first captured my interest in the subject of this dissertation. The initial interest became my doctoral dissertation, examined by Dr. David Reimer as the internal and Dr. Adrian Curtis at Manchester as the external, submitted to the University of Edinburgh in January, 2007.

I first thank God for all. His help through his angels has enabled me to finish this work.

I owe a very special debt of gratitude to my three supervisors for their critical reading of this thesis. Without a guidance of Prof. Nicolas Wyatt, who gave me immensely helpful bibliographical suggestions, this work could not have been made. Prof. A. Graeme Auld has saved me from numerous mistakes occurred in an earlier draft of this paper. I am also grateful to Prof. Hans M. Barstad, who has offered helpful suggestions.

Aside from my academic mentors, there are those to whom this work is dedicated with warm affection. For many years of constant support from my parents, Ki Hung Cho and Do Sun Yoon, and for their faithfulness and prayer, I shall always be thankful. My brother, Sang Il, and four sisters, Sang Suk, Kyung Hee, Kyung Sun and Hye Kyung, deserve mention for praying and encouraging.

Finally, there is the other one person who paid for it all. For her exuberant love and continual encouragement, I am deeply grateful to Jeong Min Yeo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	i
INTRODUCTION	1
1. Purpose of the Study	1
2. Necessity for the Study of Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible	2
3. Method of Approach	4
3.1. Concerns in Comparative Research	4
3.2. How to Compare	4
3.3. Limitations of Study	7
3.4. Textual Corpus	8
CHAPTER ONE: Membership of Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible	
Introduction	9
PART I: Membership of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Ugaritic Texts	11
1. The Ugaritic Titles of Lesser Deities	11
1.1. <i>ilm</i> 'Gods'	11
1.2. <i>il špn</i> 'Gods of Saphon'	12
1.3. <i>bn il</i> 'Sons of El'	13
1.4. <i>dr il</i> 'Circle of El'	13
1.5. <i>dr dt šmm</i> 'Circle of heaven'	14
1.6. <i>pḥr ilm</i> and ' <i>dt ilm</i> 'Assembly of gods'	14
1.7. <i>pḥr b'l</i> 'Group of Baal'	15
1.8. <i>pḥr kkbm</i> 'Assembly of Stars'	15
1.9. <i>pḥr m'd</i> 'Assembly of the Council'	17
1.10. <i>sd</i> 'Council'	17
1.11. <i>šmym</i> 'Heavenly Ones'	18
1.12. <i>šph ltpn</i> 'Offspring of the Wise One'	18
1.13. Miscellaneous Ugaritic Titles	19
Summary	20
2. Position of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Ugaritic Texts	21
2.1. Hierarchical Structure of the Divine Assembly in the Ugaritic Texts	21
2.1.1. A View of the Divine Assembly on Three Levels	21
2.1.2. A Socio-political View of the Divine Assembly in Four Groups	30
2.1.3. Hierarchical Structure of the Divine Assembly in Four Levels	31
Summary	31

2.2. Ranks of Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Ugaritic Texts	32
2.2.1. Supreme God	32
2.2.2. Core-involved Second Gods	33
2.2.3. Peripheral Second Gods	35
2.2.4. Lesser Deities Who Serve the Higher Deities	36
Summary	36
Conclusion to Chapter I, Part I	36
 PART II: Membership of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Hebrew Bible	38
1. The Hebrew Titles of Lesser Deities	38
1.1. אלהים 'Gods'	38
1.1.1. Genesis 3.5	39
1.1.2. Psalm 8.6a [ET 5a]	43
1.1.3. Psalm 82.1	43
1.1.4. Psalm 97.7b	49
1.1.5. Psalm 138.1b	50
1.2. אלים/אלם 'Gods'	51
1.3. בני אלהים or בני אלהים 'Sons of God'	52
1.4. מועד 'Assembly'	52
1.5. כוכבים (ה) 'Stars'	53
1.6. סוד אלהים (סוד יהוה) 'Council of God (Yahweh)'	53
1.7. עדה אל 'Divine Assembly' or 'Assembly of El'	54
1.8. קדשים קהל (סוד קדשים) 'Assembly (Council) of Holy Ones'	54
1.9. Miscellaneous Hebrew Titles	54
Summary	54
2. Position of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Hebrew Bible	55
2.1. Hierarchical Structure of the Divine Assembly in the Hebrew Bible	55
2.1.1. Genesis 1.26a	56
2.1.2. Genesis 3.22	57
Summary	58
2.2. Rank of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Hebrew Bible	59
2.2.1. Deuteronomy 33.2-3	59
2.2.1.1. Lesser Deities in the Original Text	62
2.2.1.2. Identity of the קדשים	64
2.2.2. 1 Kings 22.19-22 (2 Chronicles 18.18-21)	65
2.2.3. Psalm 29	68
2.2.4. Daniel 7.10b	73
Summary	75
Conclusion to Chapter I	75

CHAPTER TWO: Kinship of Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible

Introduction	77
PART I. Kinship Relation of Lesser Deities to Their Master God in the Ugaritic Texts	79
1. The Kinship Terms for Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	79
1.1. <i>ab šnm</i> 'Father of Bright Ones'	79
1.2. <i>bn il(m)</i> 'Sons of El'	81
1.2.1. <i>ab bn il</i>	83
1.2.2. <i>il bn il</i>	85
1.3. <i>bnt il</i> 'Daughters of El'	86
1.3.1. <i>bnt</i>	86
1.3.2. <i>bnt il</i>	88
1.3.3. <i>bnt hll</i>	88
1.4. <i>bn atrt</i> 'Sons of Athirat'	91
1.4.1. KTU 1.3 v 36-40	91
1.4.2. KTU 1.4 vi 44-6	93
1.4.3. KTU 1.6 v 1-4	95
1.4.4. KTU 1.4 ii 21-6	97
1.5. <i>bn qdš</i> 'Sons of the Holy One'	99
1.5.1. KTU 1.16 i 9-11	99
1.5.2. KTU 1.2 i 19-21	100
Summary	101
2. The Outward Appearance of Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	102
2.1. KTU 1.2 i 11-3	103
2.2. KTU 1.12 i 28-32	107
Summary	108
Conclusion to Chapter II, Part I	109
PART II. Kinship Relation of Lesser Deities to Their Master God in the Hebrew Bible	110
1. The Kinship Terms for Lesser Deities in the Hebrew Bible	110
1.1. בני אלהים (ה) 'Sons of God'	110
1.1.1. Genesis 6.2, 4	111
1.1.2. Deuteronomy 32.8	114
1.1.3. Job 1.6 and 2.1	118
1.1.4. בני אלים	120
1.2. בני עלין 'Sons of Elyon'	120
1.2.1. 'Fallen' Gods	122
1.2.2. " <i>bn ʿlyn</i> " in the Ugaritic Texts	123
1.2.3. National Gods	126
1.3. קדשים 'Holy Ones'	126
1.3.1. Psalm 89.6-9 [ET 5-8]	126

1.3.2. Exodus 15.11	129
Summary	130
2. The Outward Appearance of Lesser Deities in the Hebrew Bible	130
2.1. Judges 13.6	130
2.2. Ecclesiastes 10.20b	132
Summary	132
Conclusion to Chapter II	133
CHAPTER THREE: Messenger Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible	
Introduction	134
PART I. Messenger Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	135
1. The Ugaritic Titles of Messenger Deities	135
1.1. Hierarchical Titles	136
1.1.1. <i>mlak</i> 'Messenger'	136
1.1.2. <i>glm</i>	137
1.1.2.1. 'Lad'	137
1.1.2.2. 'Heir'	137
1.1.2.3. 'Goddess' or 'Bride'	137
1.1.2.4. 'Agent god'	139
1.1.2.5. 'Small One'	141
1.2. Cultic/Theophanic Title: <i>ʿnn</i>	143
1.2.1. Divine 'Cloud'	143
1.2.2. Divine 'Labourer'	146
1.2.3. 'Cloud' as a Poetical Metaphor	148
1.3. Political Titles	149
1.3.1. <i>dll</i> and <i>ʿdd</i>	149
1.3.2. <i>ṛḫt</i>	150
Summary	151
2. Named Messenger Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	151
2.1. Dual Names of Deities	152
2.2. The Duality of Gupan and Ugar	153
Summary	159
3. The Procedure of Divine Messenger Dispatch in the Ugaritic Texts	159
3.1. The Sending of Messengers	159
3.2. The Travelling of Messengers	160
3.2.1. The Formula of 'Messenger' Dispatch	160
3.2.2. The Length of the Journey	161
3.3. The Arrival of Messengers	164
3.3.1. Showing Homage to the Divine Recipient	164

3.4. The Delivering of the Message	165
3.4.1. A Formula of Messenger Speech	165
3.5. The Return of Messengers	169
Summary	170
4. Messenger Theophany in the Ugaritic Texts	171
4.1. Yam's Messengers	171
4.2. Athirat's Messenger	175
Summary	176
Conclusion to Chapter III, Part I	177
 PART II. Messenger Deities in the Hebrew Bible	178
1. The Hebrew Titles of Messenger Deities	178
1.1. Hierarchical Title: <i>mlak</i>	178
Summary	180
2. Named Messenger Deity in the Hebrew Bible	180
2.1. Gabriel	180
2.2. עיר וקדיש (עיריך) 'Watcher-and-Holy One'	182
Summary	182
3. The Procedure of Divine Messenger Dispatch in the Hebrew Bible	183
3.1. The Sending of Messengers	183
3.1.1. 1 Kings 22.22b	183
3.1.2. Psalm 78.49	183
3.1.3. The Book of Daniel	184
3.2. The Travelling of Messengers	184
3.3. The Arrival of Messengers	185
3.4. The Delivering of the Message	186
3.4.1. First Person Speech of the Messenger	186
Summary	188
4. Messenger Theophany in the Hebrew Bible	188
4.1. Exodus 3.2	188
4.2. Exodus 14.19	190
4.3. Judges 6.11-24	193
4.4. Judges 13.20a	194
4.5. Psalm 104.4	194
Summary	195
Conclusion to Chapter III	196

CHAPTER FOUR: Warrior Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible

Introduction	197
--------------	-----

PART I. Warrior Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	198
1. The Ugaritic Titles for Warrior Deities	198
1.1. <i>ib</i> 'Enemies'	198
1.2. <i>il t'dr</i> 'Helper-gods'	200
1.3. <i>'nn</i> 'Clouds'	201
1.4. <i>glm</i> 'Lads'	202
1.5. <i>hnzr</i> 'Boar'	203
1.5.1. KTU 1.5 v 6-9	205
1.5.2. KTU 1.5 iv 8-9	206
1.6. <i>mhr</i> 'Warriors'	209
1.7. <i>mḥṣ</i> 'Beaters'	213
1.8. Rapi'uma	213
Summary	216
2. Named Warrior Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	216
2.1. Qadesh-and-Amurr as a Single Deity	217
2.2. The 'Warrior' Role of Qadesh-and-Amurr	218
2.3. Yatipan	220
Summary	223
Conclusion to Chapter IV, Part I	223
 PART II. Warrior Deities in the Hebrew Bible	 225
1. The Hebrew Titles for Warrior Deities	225
1.1. אבירים 'Bulls'	225
1.2. גבורים 'Mighty Ones'	226
1.3. כוכבים 'Stars'	226
1.4. מחנה (אלהים) 'Camp (of God/gods)'	228
1.5. מלאך (יהוה) 'Messenger (of Yahweh)'	229
1.6. ממוחים 'Agents of Death'	230
1.7. מושחית (משחיתים) 'Destroyer(s)'	230
1.8. צבא(ות) 'Host'	231
1.9. קדישין 'Holy Ones'	232
1.10. שונאן 'Archers'	232
1.11. שר 'Prince'	235
Summary	236
2. Named Warrior Deity in the Hebrew Bible	236
2.1. מיכאל 'Michael'	236
Summary	238
Conclusion to Chapter IV	238

CHAPTER FIVE: Other Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible

Introduction	240
PART I. Other Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	241
1. Mediator Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	241
Summary	244
2. Guardian Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	244
2.1. Guardian Deities in the Epistle Formula	244
2.2. Guardian Deities in Mythic Texts	248
Summary	249
3. Chanter Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	250
Summary	252
4. Servant Deities in the Ugaritic Texts	252
4.1. <i>amt</i> 'Maidservant'	252
4.2. <i>'bd</i> 'Servant'	253
4.3. <i>ktrm</i> 'Skilful Ones'	253
4.4. Radaman	254
Summary	255
Conclusion to Chapter V, Part I	255
 PART II. Other Lesser Deities in the Hebrew Bible	 257
1. Mediator Deities in the Hebrew Bible	257
1.1. Job 16.19-21	257
1.2. Job 33.23-4	259
Summary	260
2. Guardian Deities in the Hebrew Bible	261
2.1. Genesis 32.2-3	261
2.2. Psalm 91.11-2	262
2.3. Exodus 23.20-23	263
2.3.1. Messenger as the Divine Guardian: the Dual Role	264
2.3.2. Messenger as the Divine Agent of Yahweh	265
2.3.3. Messenger as the Divine Forgiver	267
2.4. Cherubim	268
2.4.1. Cherubim as Guardian Deities	271
2.4.1.1. Cherubim Decorated as Guardian Deities	274
2.4.2. Cherubim as Servant Deities	276
2.4.3. Other Roles of Cherubim	278
Summary	278
3. Chanter Deities in the Hebrew Bible	279
3.1. Job 38.7	279
3.2. Psalm 103.19-21	280

3.3. Psalm 148.1-3	283
3.4. Seraphim	283
Summary	286
4. Servant Deities in the Hebrew Bible	286
Summary	287
Conclusion to Chapter V	287
CONCLUSION OF THE THESIS	289
BIBLIOGRAPHY	292

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D.N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday. 1992.
ACF	<i>Annuaire du Collège de France</i>
AcOr	<i>Acta orientalia</i>
AEL	<i>An Arabic-English Lexicon</i> . In Eight Parts. Lane, E.W. London: Williams and Norgate. 1863-93. Repr.; Cambridge, England: Islamic Texts Society. 2 vols. 1984.
AfO	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
AHw	<i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . W. von Soden. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. Vol 1 ² (1985; 1961 ¹); Vol 2-3 (1972-1981).
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AJSL	<i>The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i> .
ALASP	Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syren-Palästinas und Mesopotamiens
ANEP	<i>The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament</i> . Edited by J.B. Pritchard. 2 nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University. 1969.
ANET	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . Edited by J.B. Pritchard. 3 rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University. 1969.
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AoF	<i>Altorientalische Forschungen</i>
AOS	American Oriental Series
ARM	Archives royales de Mari
AuOr	<i>Aula orientalis</i>
BAH	Bibliothèque archéologique et historique
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BASORSup	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplements</i>
BDB	<i>The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: with An Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic</i> . F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs. 1906. Repr.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. 1997.
BDFSN	Banco de Datos Filológicos Semíticos Noroccidentales
BETL	<i>Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium</i>
BGBH	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik

BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . 5 th ed. Edited by Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. 1997.
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibLeb	<i>Bibel und Leben</i>
BibOr	<i>Biblica et orientalia</i>
BibSal	<i>Bibliotheca Salamanticensis</i>
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
BJSUC	<i>Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California</i>
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BO	<i>Bibliotheca orientalis</i>
BOS	<i>Biblical and Oriental Studies</i> . U. Cassuto. 2 Vols. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press. 1973-5.
BR	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BRev	<i>Bible Review</i>
BS	<i>The Biblical Seminar</i>
BVSAWL	<i>Berichte über die Verhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaft Leipzig</i>
BWANT	<i>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament</i>
BZAW	<i>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago, Glückstadt: Oriental Institute: Augustin Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1956-.
CARTU	<i>A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit</i> . J.C. de Moor and K. Spronk. SSS NS 6. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1987.
CBC	<i>Cambridge Bible Commentary</i>
CBSC	<i>Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CFTL	<i>Clark's Foreign Theological Library</i>
CHALOT	<i>A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . W. Holladay. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans. 1971.
CIS	<i>Copenhagen International Seminar</i>
ConBOTS	<i>Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series</i>
CPU	<i>Concordancia de Palabras Ugaríticas en Morfología Desplegada</i> . Cunchillos, J.-L., and J.-P. Vita. BDFSN Primera Parte: Datos Ugaríticos; II. 3 vols. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; Institución Fernando el Católico. 1995.

CTA	<i>Corpus des Tablettes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques Découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939.</i> Edited by A. Herdner. MRS 10. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale/Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner. 1963.
CTA	(Roman) used for text references
DBSup	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément.</i> Edited by L. Pirot and A. Robert. Paris, 1928-
DCH	<i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew.</i> Edited by D.J.A. Clines. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 1993-.
DDD	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible.</i> Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking and P.W. van der Horst. 2 nd ed. Leiden: Brill. 1999; 1995 ¹ .
DNWSI	<i>Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions.</i> 2 Vols. HOS 21. J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 2005. 1995 ¹ .
DSB	The Daily Study Bible
DUL	<i>Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition.</i> Edited and Translated by W.G.E. Watson. 2 nd ed. Leiden: Brill. 2004. 2003 ¹ . Translation of <i>Diccionario de la Lengua Ugarítica.</i> Edited by G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín. AuOrSup 7. Barcelona: AUSA. 1996, 2000.
EA	El-Amarna tablets. According to the edition of J.A. Knudtzon. <i>Die el-Amarna-Tafeln.</i> Leipzig. 1908-1915. Repr.; Aalen. 1964. Continued in A.F. Rainey, <i>El-Amarna Tablets</i> , 359-379. 2 nd revised ed. Kevelaer. 1978. <i>The Amarna Letters.</i> Edited and Translated by W.L. Moran. Johns Hopkins University Press. 1992.
ErIsr	<i>Eretz-Israel</i>
EstBib	<i>Estudios bíblicos</i>
ETL	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
ETSMS	Evangelical Theological Society Monograph Series
EvT	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
FB	<i>Forschung zur Bibel</i>
FoiVie	<i>Foi et vie</i>
FuF	<i>Forschungen und Fortschritte</i>
GHLOTS	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures: Numerically Coded to Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, with an English Index of More Than 12,000 Entries.</i> W. Gesenius. Translated by S.P. Tregelles. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1979. Translation of <i>Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti</i>

	<i>Libros; a Latin version of Hebräisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch des Alten Testaments. 2 vols. 1810-12¹.</i>
GTJ	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>
HALOT	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner. Revised by W. Baumgartner and J.J. Stamm. Trans. and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson. 5 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1994-2000. Translation of Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament.</i>
HAT	<i>Handbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
HBD	<i>Harper's Bible Dictionary</i>
HCLOT	<i>A Hebrew & Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament; with an Introduction Giving a Short History of Hebrew Lexicography. Fuerst, J. 3rd ed. Translated by S. Davidson. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz; London: Williams & Norgate. 1867</i>
HdO	<i>Handbuch der Orientalistik</i>
HRH	<i>Handbooks on the History of Religions</i>
HOS	<i>Handbook of Oriental Studies</i>
HSM	<i>Harvard Semitic Monographs</i>
HSS	<i>Harvard Semitic Studies</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IBC	<i>Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching</i>
ICC	<i>International Critical Commentary</i>
IDB	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by G.A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press. 4 vols (1962); Supplementary vol (1976).</i>
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
ISJ	<i>Institución San Jerónimo</i>
ITC	<i>International Theological Commentary</i>
JANES	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBR	<i>Journal of Bible and Religion</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JEOL	<i>Jaarbericht ... ex oriente lux</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JHC	<i>Journal of Higher Criticism</i>
JHNES	<i>Johns Hopkins Near Eastern Studies</i>

JLCRS	Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion Series
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JPOS	<i>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society</i>
JPSTC	JPS Torah Commentary
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>
JS	<i>Journal for Semitics</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAI	<i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> . H. Donner and W. Röllig. 2 nd ed. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. 1966-9.
KAI	(Roman) used for text references
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
KTU	KTU ¹ = <i>Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit</i> . Edited by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartín. AOAT 24/1. Kevelaer: Butzon und Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag. 1976. KTU ² = <i>The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places</i> . 2 nd enlarged ed. of KTU. Edited by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartín. ALASP 8. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag. 1995.
KTU	(Roman) used for text references
LAPO	Littératures Anciennes du Proche-Orient
LLAVT	<i>Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti: documentis antiquis illustratum</i> . Edited by E. Vogt. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum. 1971.
LVT	<i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros</i> . L. Köhler and W. Baumgartner. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1958.
LXX	<i>Septuaginta</i> . 3 rd ed. Edited by A. Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt. 1949.
MARI	<i>Mari: Annales des recherches interdisciplinaires</i>
MCAAS	<i>Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences</i>
MRS	Mission de Ras Shamra
MUSJ	<i>Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph</i>
NCB	New Century Bible
NCBC	The New Century Bible Commentary

NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NME	The Near and Middle East
NTT	<i>Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift</i>
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OLP	<i>Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica</i>
OLZ	<i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</i>
Or	<i>Orientalia</i>
OrAnt	<i>Oriens antiquus</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
PAOSOS	Publications of the American Oriental Society Offprint Series
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PLO	Porta Linguarum Orientalium
POLO	Proche-Orient et littérature ougaritique
POS	Pretoria Oriental Series
PRU	<i>Le palais royal d'Ugarit</i>
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
RES	<i>Revue des études sémitiques</i>
RHR	<i>Revue de l'Histoire des Religions</i>
RIH	Ras Ibn Hani excavation/tablet number
RS	Ras Shamra excavation/tablet number
RSF	<i>Rivista di Studi Fenici</i>
RS-O	Ras Shamra-Ougarit
RSO	<i>Rivista degli studi orientali</i>
RSR	<i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i>
RSP	<i>Ras Shamra Parallels</i> . Edited by L.R. Fisher <i>et al.</i> AnOr 49-51. 3 vols. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute. 1972-81.
RV	Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher
SBB	Soncino Books of the Bible
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLWAW	Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World
SBONT	Sacred Books of the Old and New Testaments
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SEL	<i>Studi epigrafici e linguistici</i>
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SLBA	Schweich Lectures of the British Academy

SP	Studia Pohl
SPIB	Scripta Pontifici instituti biblici
SS	Studi semitici
SSMS	Shelton Semitic Monograph Series
SSS	Semitic Studies Series
ST	<i>Studia theologica</i>
TBC	Torch Bible Commentaries
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel. Translated by G.W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1964-76. Translation of <i>Theologisches wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> .
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Translated by J.T. Willis, G.W. Bromiley and D.E. Green. 14 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1974-. Translation of <i>Theologisches wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> . 1970-.
TLOT	<i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by E. Jenni, with assistance from C. Westermann. Translated by M.E. Biddle. 3 Vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. 1997. Translation of <i>Theologisches handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> . Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag. 1971-6.
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
UBL	Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
UF	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i> .
Ug	<i>Ugaritica</i> . MRS series. Edited by C.F.A. Schaeffer. 7 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner. 1939-78.
UT	<i>Ugaritic Textbook; Grammar, Texts in Transliteration, Cuneiform Selections, Glossary, Indices</i> . C.H. Gordon. AnOr 38. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico. 1965.
UT	(Roman) used for text references
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	<i>Vetus Testamentum, Supplements</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WBT	<i>Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie</i>
WdM	<i>Wörterbuch der Mythologie</i> . I. Abt. Die alten Kulturvölker. Bd. 1. Götter und Mythen im Vorderen Orient. Edited by H.W. Haussig. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett. 1965.

WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WO	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUS	<i>Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache</i> . 4 th ed. J. Aistleitner. BVS AWL Phil.-Hist. Klasse Bd. 106; Heft 3. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 1974; 1958 ¹ .
ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBASAW	Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie Sonderbände der Antiken Welt
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
ZRGG	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>

GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS

acc.	accusative
act.	active
adj.	adjective
Akk.	Akkadian
Amm.	Ammonite
Amor.	Amorite
Ar.	Arabic
Aram.	Aramaic
ASV	American Standard Version
BH	Biblical Hebrew
c.	common
Copt.	Coptic
du.	dual
D.	doubled: piel
DN	divine name
EA Akk.	Akkadian from El Amarna
Ebla.	Eblaite
Eg.	Egyptian
ET	English Translation
Eth.	Ethiopic
f.	feminine
G.	basic (ground) verbal stem, qal
gen.	genitive
Gk.	Greek
Gpass	G. passive
Gt.	verbal G stem with -t- infix
H.	hiphil
Heb.	Hebrew
<i>ibid.</i>	<i>ibidem</i> , in the same place
idem.	the same
impf.	imperfect
impv.	imperative
inf.	infinitive
KJV	King James Version
LB	Living Bible
lit.	literally
LXX	Septuagint
m. or masc.	masculine

Moab.	Moabite
Mss	manuscripts
MT	Masoretic Text (of the OT)
N.	N-stem; "Niphal" in BH
n(n).	footnote(s), noun
NAB	New American Bible
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NIV	New International Version
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NJPS	Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures: The New JPS translation according to the Traditional Hebrew Text
NKJV	New King James Version
no.	number
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
OB	Old Babylonian
obj.	object
pass.	passive
pf.	perfect
Ph.	Phoenician
pl.	plural
PN	personal name
pron.	pronoun
ptc.	participle
Pun.	Punic
Q	qal
R	recto
RS	Ras Shamra, text number
R.S.	Ras Shamra, excavation number
RS Akk.	Akkadian from Ras Shamra
RSV	Revised Standard Version
s	Syriac (Peshitta)
š.	verbal stem with š-prefix
Samal.	Samalian
sc.	scilicet, namely
sg.	singular
suff.	suffix
Sum.	Sumerian
TN	toponym
Ug.	Ugaritic
v./vv.	verse/verses

v	Latin Vulgate
x	traces of an indefinable character
u	Samaritan Pentateuch
1.	first person
2.	second person
3.	third person
*	hypothetical form or root
<>	missing sign
{ }	redundant sign
	parallel
[]	restored letters of damaged signs
[[]]	erased sign(s), line
√	radical
()	addition to make good English

INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose of the Study

The present study aims to investigate whether or not there are affinities between the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible with regard to the nature and roles of divine beings ranked as lesser deities¹ in the divine assembly².

The unearthing of clay tablets excavated from the site at Ras Shamra in Syria beginning in 1929 and from its neighbouring site at Ras Ibn Hani since 1975, has yielded considerable evidence regarding the religious beliefs of the ancient Ugaritians³. As a result, it has been realised that Ugaritic mythology and religion have numerous striking similarities to Israelite religion, probably due to their geographical closeness⁴ and philological connection⁵.

¹ The usage of the term 'lesser deity' in the present study has a connotation of its hierarchical status belonging to the lowest class in the divine assembly. It will be applied to both the Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew corpus hereafter.

² In this research three indications of 'divine assembly', 'divine council' and 'pantheon' are to be interchangeably used to denote the plurality of deities.

³ An accidental discovery of a burial cave by a Syrian peasant at Minet el-Beida in 1928 raised archaeological concerns. As a result, initial excavations at the Minet el-Beida site and the Ras Shamra tell were conducted by the French archaeological mission, directed by C.F.-A. Schaeffer, beginning in 1929. A tell at Ras Ibn Hani, located about 5 km southwest from Ras Shamra, was excavated also by a Franco-Syrian mission, led by A. Bounni and J. Lagarde. For a brief history of excavations, see D. Pardee (1992: 695-8). Ugaritic texts have been deciphered by endeavours of several scholars, and its outcome has been reported in publications: *Syria* (Paris), etc. For a short history of decipherment, see P.L. Day (2002: 223-7).

⁴ Located on the Syrian coast, opposite Cyprus, the city of Ugarit thus functioned as a centre of the ancient ocean trade and may have been well known in the ancient Semitic world (e.g., the name Ugarit is found in an Eblaite list of toponyms [*Ug-ga-ra-at^{ki}*] and in the Mari texts: cf. Pardee, 1992: 699-700). The tablets excavated from the site of Ras Shamra have been traced to the period from the first half of the fourteenth century B.C.E. to the latter part of the thirteenth century, considering the date of the destruction of Ugarit ca. 1180 B.C.E. (cf.

Meanwhile, the analysis of the lesser deities occurring in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible has become one of the essential subjects for comparative study in order to discover the points of contact between the two religions. The present study has been motivated by previous studies on this issue and, therefore, has the intention to discover affinities between Ugaritic religious beliefs of the lesser deities and early Hebrew conceptions of them⁶.

2. Necessity for the Study of Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible

A comparative study of the lesser deities in Ugaritic religious texts and the Hebrew Bible has, in fact, already been conducted⁷. Nevertheless, it is now

Pardee, *ibid.*: 701, 706), although the oral composition of the literary texts goes back to earlier periods. Nevertheless, it is possible to take the view that Ugaritic tradition, either in oral or written form, may have been related to Hebrew religious tradition.

⁵ Ugaritic is classified as a Northwest Semitic language, which group also includes biblical Hebrew. Moreover, since it is an older form than biblical Hebrew in phonology, word formation, and inflection, the poetic structure of Ugaritic is noteworthy for its linguistic link to biblical Hebrew: S. Segert (1997: x). Since Ugaritic is related closely to biblical Hebrew, it can be the primary external source of information for the establishment of the Israelite religious tradition. The three major portions of the Ugaritic myth, the Baal Cycle (KTU 1.1-6); the Keret Epic (KTU 1.14-16); and the Aqhat Epic (KTU 1.17-19), are presented in a poetic style, which is similarly found in biblical Hebrew poetry.

⁶ On the fact that there are many similarities between biblical texts and extra-biblical materials, H. Ringgren (1977: 32) points out that "Nobody would deny this. But Old Testament scholars have not reached any consensus on the method for utilizing this material. All too often, research in this area has turned into a kind of 'parallel hunting': the endeavor has been to find extra-biblical parallels for biblical ideas or customs—and as soon as such a parallel has been found, all problems seem to be solved: the parallel is there, what more do we need?".

⁷ Recent enquiries in this academic area may be listed as following: A. Rofé (1969); D. Irvin (1978); K.M. Alomía (1987); and some brief articles such as: J.-L. Cunchillos (1969; 1981a; and 1982); O. Loretz (1975); L.K. Handy (1990; 1994: 149-167); M.C.A. Korpel (1996), *et al.* Ugaritic references on the lesser deities have, however, been only partially treated and left

necessary to reconsider the issue for, at least, two main reasons: firstly, the issue has a potential importance to contribute abundantly a new understanding of ancient Syro-Palestinian religions, including the Israelite religion, by suggesting new references to some of the theological arguments such as monotheism, polytheism, demonology, divine warfare, divine guidance, etc.

Furthermore, it may supply newly cultivated references to New Testament studies regarding biblical "angelology". Thus, the study of Ugaritic-Hebrew lesser deities will shed more light on the scholarly interpretation of biblical theology.

Secondly, the issue of Ugaritic lesser deities has only been partially dealt with in regard to other issues concerned⁸. Thus, the nature and significance of roles played by Ugaritic lesser deities have not received the

largely unaccomplished. Among them, Irvin (1978) has set the foundation for the comparative study of the "angelic" motifs in the literatures of the ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible (but only in the book of Genesis). By drawing several mythological motifs from these literatures she furnished comparative possibilities for a better understanding of six "angelic" stories in Genesis: i.e., Gen 16; 18; 19; 21.8-21; 22; 28.10-22. She indicates the fact that there are some parallels concerning the "angelic" stories in the narratives of Genesis and Ugaritic mythology (Anat and Baal). Yet, she has briefly treated Ugaritic materials just in nine pages (*ibid.*: 73-81). In his doctoral dissertation, Alomía (1987) also dealt with the issue of lesser gods in the Ugaritic texts, but only in part, with other various Semitic references from Mesopotamian and Hittite sources to compare with those in biblical Hebrew texts. It has been compared with an iconographical concern. Yet its origin and development were beyond his concern, as he mentioned in his dissertation (*ibid.*: 19-21, 23). Besides these works, Cunchillos' monograph (1976a) has been dedicated with more intensive analysis to the area of comparative study. However, he has dealt only with the Ugaritic formula *bn il(m)* in some collected Ugaritic texts (mostly, in KTU 1.4; 1.5; 1.6; 1.23; and 1.40) and biblical Hebrew texts (Deut 32.8, 43; Ps 29; 96.7-8; 1 Chr 16.28-9; and Gen 6.1-4).

⁸ It has been approached in some measure to reflect upon other issues, such as the 'divine warrior' (P.D. Miller, 1975: 12-63) or 'divine council' (E.T. Mullen, 1980; Handy, 1994). Although the study of Ugaritic lesser deities itself has been pursued by Ugaritologists (H.L. Ginsberg, 1944; M.J. Dahood, 1958; R.M. Good, 1978; Wyatt, 1987b, *et al.*), it has not been fully considered yet in its various dimensions.

attention which they deserve. For this reason alone, it requires a thorough work with further consideration of Ugaritic-Hebrew lesser deities.

In addition, newly excavated Ugaritic evidence (e.g., RIH 78.20 = KTU 1.169) has been brought to hand. These additional materials provide another reason to carry out a reappraisal of the issue. Therefore, study is required to give a more comprehensive reassessment of Ugaritic lesser deities with recent results from Ugaritic studies. The issue of lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible will then be compared with the latest revelations from Ugaritic sources and disciplined study.

3. Method of Approach

3.1. Concerns in Comparative Research

With the aim of a comprehensive reappraisal of lesser deities, the present research seeks to find affinities between Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew descriptions of their nature and roles. Consequently it will be a process of enquiries about their membership of the divine assembly, kinship, and their various roles, such as messenger, warrior, mediator, guardian, chanter or servant.

3.2. How to Compare

Various methods have been used to approach the current issue. Irvin adopted and developed the form-critical method of Hermann Gunkel for her comparative study of ancient Near Eastern literatures, including the Ugaritic corpus, and the book of Genesis with regard to the lesser deities. She

classified various plot-motifs found in the narratives through her own study⁹. Nevertheless, a more fundamental textual analysis is needed to approach the Ugaritic materials in order to decipher the exact meaning from the reserved tablets.

Alomía also has made a comparative study of the lesser deities between ancient Near Eastern literatures and the Hebrew Bible via a literary search for descriptions and an iconographical exploration¹⁰. However, iconographical representations or cylinder seals for the lesser deities from Ras Shamra are not seen crucial for comparison.

Recently, Handy has applied a socio-political criterion to the issue on the basis of his bureaucratic model. He classified the structure of Syro-Palestinian pantheons including Ugaritic and Hebrew corpuses. According to his analysis, messenger deities are on the lowest level of the Ugaritic and Hebrew pantheons¹¹. However, it is a too modern criterion to categorise ancient conceptions of the lesser deities.

The study of this area requires more direct support from textual analyses. Therefore, the comparative Semitic¹² philological¹³ approach which has been adopted and evidently examined by Cunchillos¹⁴ will be employed for the exegetical analysis of several selected Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew passages with regard to the lesser deities.

⁹ Irvin (1978: esp., see VIII-XV; 1-32).

¹⁰ Alomía (1987).

¹¹ Handy (1994: esp., see 149-67).

¹² The term 'Semitic' is applied to the linguistic group of all the languages used in western Asia, which includes Akkadian, Aramaic, Ugaritic, Hebrew, Arabic and Canaanites, etc. For the definition of 'Semitic' and classification of the Semitic languages, see Moscati (1964: 3-21).

¹³ The comparative Semitic philology consists of the study of the phonology, morphology, grammar, syntax, history and interpretation of Semitics.

¹⁴ Cunchillos (1976a).

In the following chapters, any Ugaritic or biblical Hebrew terms which indicate 'lesser deity/-ties' henceforth will be selected and categorised to compare and find points of similarity. Thus it is essential, first of all, to identify the denotation or connotation of each Ugaritic or biblical Hebrew term representing lesser deities in each category.

Any Ugaritic terms will be compared with Akkadian, Aramaic, Hebrew, Arabic or other Semitic cognates in order to reconstruct the original meaning. It is significant to determine the denotation or connotation of Ugaritic terms for it is often inseparable from issues of interpretation of the Ugaritic texts. Biblical Hebrew terms will be defined in the same way.

Meantime, translators' various scholarly explanations of Ugaritic terms on the basis of philological analyses will be suggested and discussed to make an exact translation of the Ugaritic texts. Hebrew terms in the biblical Hebrew texts will be dealt within a variety of philological analyses of modern commentators, as well.

Then, how the definition of Ugaritic or Hebrew terms functions in the Ugaritic or biblical Hebrew texts, in which they occur, will be explored. Any Ugaritic or Hebrew terms defined under philological analyses will be compared with other occurrences in a similar situation, plot, or speech in the Ugaritic or biblical Hebrew texts selected for the study. The philological analysis thus will comprise the study of the grammar, syntax, history and critical interpretation of exegetes of the Ugaritic or biblical Hebrew texts.

After these analyses, it may be possible to eventually understand the exact meaning of the Ugaritic or biblical Hebrew texts in order to identify the nature of lesser deities and the function of their roles.

All conclusions taken from the investigation of the Ugaritic texts will be applied to the studies of the biblical Hebrew texts. Since the Ugaritic texts

contain early conceptions of the ancient Syro-Palestinian lesser deities it is necessary to analyse them first and then, on the basis of the results obtained, to reassess biblical Hebrew texts, in which similar imagery of lesser deities is present. This method, arranged as firstly Ugaritic (in Part I), then biblical Hebrew (in Part II), will be adopted in each chapter.

3.3. Limitations of Study

The area of the study will be limited to the issue of 'lesser deities', who belong to the lowest class in the hierarchy of the divine assembly and serve their master deities as assistant deities. Thus, any secondary gods in the Ugaritic texts, ranked next to the supreme god in a divine hierarchy, will be excluded in the present research¹⁵.

Any discussion of the motif of demons in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible will not be included in the present investigation in order to avoid excessively broad approach to the research¹⁶.

Research texts will be restricted to the Ugaritic texts and biblical Hebrew texts. Although every Ugaritic text with regard to lesser deities is of importance, only some 'case' Ugaritic descriptions will be investigated in this research, as well as biblical Hebrew references.

However, whilst probing the texts from both Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew literature, the research will be responsible for using other relevant Semitic evidence for each discussion, such as Akkadian references excavated from Ugarit, if necessary in order to acquire a broader perspective of the

¹⁵ The division of secondary gods will be explained under the category of Rank of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Ugaritic Texts in Chapter I.

¹⁶ 'Demons' or 'evil spirits', which may be classified also as lesser deities, are found in the Ugaritic texts (cf. J.C. de Moor, 1980c; 1981-2; Y. Avishur, 1981; de Moor-Spronk, 1984; *et al.*) and in the Hebrew Bible (cf. M.J. Gruenthaner, 1944; R.S. Kluger, 1967; P.L. Day, 1988; *et al.*).

issue. Some significant texts of the Aramaic portions in the book of Daniel will be used. These texts will then provide material for comment.

3.4. Textual Corpus

For our citation of the Ugaritic texts, the research will basically use all references to the texts from *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and other Places* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995), edited by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, abbreviated as *KTU*² from now on, unless there is a specific reason for doing otherwise. In some cases, the texts may be modified from *KTU*² for the best reading from the fragmentary condition of Ugaritic tablets. For the use of the biblical Hebrew texts, we will take *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997), designated as *BHS* henceforth. The Septuagint texts used for comparison will be supplied from *Septuaginta*, edited by A. Rahlfs (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1949), indicated as *LXX* hereafter.

All translations of cited texts from *KTU*², *BHS*, and *LXX* will be made by the writer himself. Otherwise, translations of texts will be provided in footnotes.

CHAPTER ONE:

Membership of Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible

Introduction

This chapter will investigate the status of lesser deities in the hierarchically classified¹ divine assembly. As a first step, our concern will be to categorise a variety of Ugaritic and Hebrew titles for lesser deities occurring in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible into 'titles of lesser deities'. The reassessed definitions and conceptions of the divine titles will be employed for analysing the position of lesser deities in the hierarchical pantheon illustrated in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible.

The result from the Ugaritic studies, then, will be compared with biblical Hebrew references to divine beings other than Yahweh to find out affinities in the texts, in which their identity as lesser deities and their position as the lowest class in the divine assembly are attested².

For our catalogue, the study will define Ugaritic terms of lesser deities, which are selected from Wyatt's previous studies³, and which require further special examinations⁴. Any DN in the Ugaritic texts will be excluded

¹ The divine hierarchy denotes, in the present research, the structure of the ranks among the gods in the pantheon. For further discussion of this issue, cf. the previous works dedicated by Clifford (1972), Mullen (1980), and Handy (1994). The rank of gods in the divine hierarchy depends, especially in Ugaritic mythology, on how close they are to the divine kingship, which is analogous to the human hierarchy.

² In Part II, we will deal with the biblical Hebrew verses: Gen 1.26a; 3.22; Deut 33.2-3; 1 Kgs 22.19-22 (2 Chr 18.18-21); Ps 29; and Dan 7.10b, etc. Basically building on the discovery of Ugaritic texts, the study will compare this Ugaritic source with the biblical Hebrew references.

³ Wyatt (1998b: 41-58).

⁴ Thus, *ilm*; *il špn*; *bn il*; *dr il*; *dr dt šmm*; *phr ilm*; *‘dt ilm*; *phr b‘l*; *phr kkbm*; *phr m‘d*; *sd*; *šmym*; *šph ltpn* and other designations.

from the catalogue⁵. Any Hebrew term which indicates lesser deities will be chosen for our study in the chapter. Thus, some Hebrew collective nouns will be treated as well in Part II⁶. The result from the Ugaritic studies in Part I of Chapter I will be applied to the Hebrew studies in Part II in order to find out its relevance in the Hebrew Bible.

For the examination of Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew terms and texts, philological analyses will be made. For the catalogue, some have already arranged the formal groups of DNs or divine titles: representatively, de Moor⁷ and Pardee⁸. They have classified all kinds of variants of DNs or divine titles, including the supreme god and secondary deities, which are utilised to make a pantheon list and to demonstrate the polytheistic religious system of the Ugaritians. However, the area of their corpora is too broad to be dealt with here for our research of lesser deities. Thus, for a more realistic research, we will have to select representative titles of lesser deities from the pantheon lists.

⁵ Nevertheless, we will inspect some crucial DNs of lesser deities in the following chapters: e.g., *gpn w ugr* (Gupan and Ugar) and *qdš w amrr* (Qadesh-and-Amurr), etc.

⁶ Hence, אל; סוד יהוה; סוד אלוה; סוד קדשים; קהל קדשים; קדשים; (בני אלהים) בני אל(ים); ערה; and הר מועד, etc.

⁷ De Moor (1970).

⁸ Pardee (2000: [2] 962-96).

PART I: Membership of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Ugaritic Texts

To discover the identity of divine beings ranked as the lowest level in the hierarchical divine assembly, it is necessary to enquire into some Ugaritic collective terms, which imply their existence belonging to the divine assembly as members, and examine some Ugaritic texts, which illuminate their hierarchical position in the divine assembly.

1. The Ugaritic Titles of Lesser Deities

The research will now survey some Ugaritic collective terms that reflect the existence of plural deities, including lesser deities⁹, and demonstrate how the definitions of these terms should be applied.

1.1. *ilm* 'Gods'

This term is a generic form which expresses the plurality of Ug. *il*, 'god'¹⁰ (KTU 1.1 iv 6, and *passim*)¹¹. Lesser deities are often stated as 'gods' in the Ugaritic texts (KTU 1.3 iii 32; 1.15 iii 19; 1.17 i 2-3, etc.). All lesser deities in the celestial assembly may be identified as 'gods', as well as their master god.

⁹ Ugaritic terms for the divine assembly have been debated extensively so far: representatively, de Moor (1970); Wyatt (1998b: esp., 41-6); and Pardee (2000: [2] 962-96). Also, for the theme of the 'divine assembly' itself, cf. Oldenburg (1969: 15-142); Miller (1973: 12-23); Mullen (1980); del Olmo (1984b: 35-65; 1999: 43-86); Healey (1985); Korpel (1990: 269-73); Handy (1994); and Wyatt (1996: 323-30). We will here briefly survey some representative terms for plural gods, which may implicitly include lesser deities, in alphabetical order. Some terms which denote 'theogonic' or 'kinship' terms of the gods will be excluded here and dealt with later in Chapter II: thus, *bn atrt*, 'Sons of Athirat'; *bn qdš*, 'Sons of the Holy One'; *šbrt aryh*, the 'clan of her kinsmen'; and *šbʿm bn atrt*, the 'seventy Sons of Athirat', etc.

¹⁰ Ug. *il*, 'god, a DN'. Cf. Heb. לַא: HALOT 48-50; Ph., Pun., Aram. ʾl: DNWSI 53-5; Akk. *ilu*: AHW 373-4.; CAD 7[I/J] 91-104.

¹¹ Ug. *ilhm*, another plural form of Ug. *il*, also occurs at KTU 1.39.3, etc.

1.2. *il špn*¹² 'Gods¹³ of Saphon¹⁴

Here the phrase conveys a comprehensive conception of all the gods from each hierarchical rank of the divine mountain, where the divine assembly is situated¹⁵: from the supreme god El to all his lesser gods¹⁶. The divine assembly is gathered at Saphon¹⁷ and the gods hold a banquet there¹⁸. Mount Saphon is a representation of the divine mountain in Ugaritic mythology¹⁹. It

¹² It occurs at the headline of the pantheon lists (KTU 1.47.1).

¹³ Ug. *il* in the phrase occurs as the construct of the pl. form.

¹⁴ Wyatt (1996: 27) relates the Ugaritic name of the mountain *Šapunu*, based on the Akkadian reference, rather than on its common vocalisation as '*Sapan*', to Heb. *Šāpôn* as it appears at Job 26.7: נָטָה צִפּוֹן עַל חֲדָו חֲלָה אֶרֶץ עַל בְּלִי מָה, 'He is stretching out Saphon over emptiness (and) he is hanging the earth over nothingness'; this term is better understood when it is translated as the proper noun (NJPS; NRSV) rather than as the geographical direction 'north'; it is paralleled with the אֶרֶץ in a sense of a "concrete substance"; hence, Heb. צִפּוֹן may correspond to the sacred mountain as in the Ugaritic texts; thus, Wyatt takes 'Saphon' for the 'conventional transliteration' in terms of Ug. *špn* and Heb. צִפּוֹן. On the form of Saphon and its pronunciation, see Wyatt (1995a).

¹⁵ Cf. Wyatt (1998b: 42).

¹⁶ Wyatt (1998b: 46) argues that the *il špn* denotes a fact that the "pantheon is a cohesive, cooperative association of supernatural powers, who may be described as working broadly in concert".

¹⁷ In KTU 1.2 i 13-4, Yam's messengers are sent to Mount Saphon: *ʿm pḥr mʿd t[k ḡr il]*, 'towards the assembly of the council; tow[ards the divine mountain]'. *KTU²* reads *ḡr ll* on the basis of KTU 1.2 i 20. However, the phrase *ḡr ll* must be a scribal error of *ḡr il*; cf. del Olmo (1981: 170, 572) and Wyatt (1985b: 381; 1995c: 135-6; 1996: 44; and 2002: 58). For the contrary view, see de Moor (1970: 202): the 'mountain of Lēlu'; and M.S. Smith (1986b). Some sides of Saphon appear in the Ugaritic texts: Inbub (*inbb*, KTU 1.1 ii 13), where El's messengers are sent, and also introduced as the dwelling of Anat (KTU 1.13.9; 1.100.20), is located on the massif of Saphon (Wyatt, 1996: 47); Aruru (*arr*, KTU 1.10 iii 29) appears to be part of the Saphon massif as well.

¹⁸ KTU 1.2 i 20-1.

¹⁹ Cf. Wyatt (1995c: 123).

is recognised also as the 'centre of the world'²⁰ and signifies 'reality, life, and the presence' of the supreme god²¹.

1.3. *bn il* 'Sons of El'

The foregoing element is followed by the main term, which is in a genitive form and refers to the DN of a 'controlling figure'²², and indicates a 'clan identity' as well as Ug. *dr*²³. Thus the construction of the phrasal form of *bn* with the DN may express the subordinate group of the DN.

1.4. *dr il*²⁴ 'Circle of El'

This phrase is the most common expression for the plural conception of gods and indicates the family 'circle of El'²⁵. It is used to denote the 'lesser deities' of El (KTU 1.15 iii 19, etc.).

²⁰ Cf. Wyatt (1996: 27-48; also 1995c). The Hebrew Bible also locates Paradise on a mountain (Ezek 28.13-14).

²¹ Wyatt (1996: 27).

²² Wyatt (1998b: 42) remarks that the phrase in this case may be theologically construed as the "subsumption of deities under the implicit aegis, or as hypostatic forms, of the controlling figure". We shall discuss this phrase further, under the category of 'Kinship Terms for Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts' of Chapter II.

²³ Wyatt (1998b: 47).

²⁴ KTU 1.15 iii 19; 1.39.7; 1.40.7, [17], 25, 33-4, 42; 1.41.[16]; 1.87.[17-8]; and 1.122.[3].

²⁵ Cf. Heb. דָּוָר whose basic idea is a 'circle' (thus also, 'generation'): HALOT 217-8; and Ph. and Pun. *dr*: DNWSI 258-9. With its basic sense Ug. *dr* may denote a 'circle' of relatives of DN; sc. a family of DN: Neuberg (1950: 215-6); Dahood (1972: 112); Wyatt (1998b: 44); and DUL 279-80. The fact that it indicates a filial relation of the lesser deities to El is supported further in a usage of the phrase: *dr bn il*, '(family) circle of Sons of El': KTU 1.65.2.

1.5. *dr dt šmm* 'Circle²⁶ of heaven'

The term occurs paralleled with other designations of the divine assembly: *bn il*; *pḥr kkbm* (KTU 1.10 i 3-5)²⁷. It indicates the family membership of the celestial beings.

1.6. *pḥr ilm* and '*dt ilm* 'Assembly of gods'

The two collective designations *pḥr ilm*²⁸ and '*dt ilm*²⁹ (the 'assembly of gods' or the 'assembly of El³⁰')³¹ express the plurality and cooperation of the deities.

The *pḥr ilm* can be defined as the 'group of gods as a unity'³². It occurs in the reception of a ram as an offering at KTU 1.148.9; all other individual gods who receive their own offerings in KTU 1.148 may be regarded as the 'members of the *pḥr ilm*'³³. But since 'not all the gods can realistically be given'³⁴, the phrase may indicate a specific 'group of gods'. Here they are possibly identified as anonymous 'lesser deities' of the divine assembly.

²⁶ Or, 'generation(s)': Wyatt (1998b: 44; 2002: 155).

²⁷ Parker (1999c: 795).

²⁸ Ug. *pḥr*, 'total number, host, assembly': G.R. Driver (1956: 162); DUL 669-70 (I). Cf. Akk. *paḥāru(m)*, *puḥru*: AHw 810-11, 876-7; CAD 12[P] 23-32; 485-93. Cf. Akk. *puḥur ilāni*: Cross (1953: 274 n. 1). This Ugaritic phrase can be compared with the Phoenician reference *mḥrt ʿl gbl qdšm*, the 'assembly of the holy gods of Byblos' (KAI 4.4-5). In the pantheon list: KTU 1.47.29; 1.118.28; in the ritual list: KTU 1.148.9. Its longer phrase (*pḥr bn ilm*) appears in KTU 1.4 iii 14; cf. another form, *mḥrt bn il*, is found also in some liturgical texts: KTU 1.40.[8], 17, 25, 34, 42; 1.65.3; and 1.122.3-[4]. Ug. *mḥrt* is regarded as a f. ptc. form here, denoting a 'legal-political' qualification of the pantheon: Wyatt (1998b: 44-5). Cf. Gordon (1965: §19.2037; in §19.2036, Ug. *pḥyr* is said as 'members of a household').

²⁹ Ug. '*dt*; 'assembly', denoting basically 'meeting': DUL 151-2; cf. the מועד, 'meeting', עדה, 'congregation': BDB 417; HALOT 557-8, 789-90; Aram. '*dt*: DNWSI 828. The phrase '*dt ilm* occurs only twice, in KTU 1.15 ii 7 and 11.

³⁰ Ug. *ilm* can be read here as the plural 'gods' or as the singular 'El' (plus enclitic *m*).

³¹ Phoenician has similar expressions: *dr ʿil*, *mḥrt ʿilm*, or *pḥr bn ʿilm*, etc. (KAI 4.4-5); also, cf. Akk. *puḥur ilāni*.

³² Wyatt (1998b: 45).

³³ Wyatt (1998b: 45).

³⁴ Wyatt (1998b: 45).

Wyatt concludes acceptably that “its specific use in KTU 1.47 and parallels, in distinction from other sub-groups, evidently shows that in some cases at least it has a narrower reference”³⁵.

1.7. *phr b^cl* ‘Group of Baal’

Apparently Baal has his own assembly; perhaps given after his enthronement in the divine assembly (KTU 1.4 iv 43-4), and in reference to the usage of the first element in the phrase *phr b^cl* (cf. KTU 1.39.7; 1.41.[16]; and 1.87.18)³⁶.

Yet there is no other indication in the Ugaritic texts to prove that Baal has sovereignty over his own assembly. Pope remarks that the usage of Ug. *phr* is applied freely to any plural conception of the gods rather than necessarily always to ‘a plenary session or perfect attendance’ of the gods³⁷.

Thus, it is best seen that Ug. *phr* is used here to indicate the agent ‘group’ which serves Baal: sc. ‘group of Baal’³⁸. It has been suggested that it may designate the seven Baals of KTU 1.47.5-11 (paralleled with KTU 1.118.4-10 and RS 20.24.4-10)³⁹. Yet it indicates more probably the *il t^cdr*, ‘Helper-gods’ of Baal⁴⁰, who may be identified as ‘seven Lads; eight Boars’ in KTU 1.5 v 8-9.

1.8. *phr kkbm* ‘Assembly of Stars’

The divine assembly is described as comprising the caretakers of the cosmos:

³⁵ Wyatt (1998b: 45).

³⁶ Thus, see Parker (1999a: 206).

³⁷ Pope (1955: 48).

³⁸ Cf. del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 670).

³⁹ Wyatt (1998b: 45). In the Ugaritic texts, however, the final *-m* of *b^clm* seems to occur rather as an enclitic than as a pl. suffix.

⁴⁰ For further discussion on the phrase, cf. *il t^cdr* ‘Helper-gods’ in Chapter IV.

the sun (Shapsh⁴¹), the moon (Yarih⁴²), etc. Among them the countless celestial spheres are portrayed metaphorically as the members of the divine assembly, as they were regarded as divine beings in the ancient Semitic world⁴³:

pḥr kkbm The assembly of Stars⁴⁴

(KTU 1.10 i 4⁴⁵);

The *pḥr kkbm* occurs here in a parallelism with the *dr dt šmm*, 'circle of heavens' at line 5 to indicate the collectivity of the celestial beings. It appears further in the description of KTU 1.19 iv 22-5 (|| 29-31):

w yqr[y] dbḥ ilm And he (sc. Danel) offered⁴⁶ a sacrifice (for)
the gods;

⁴¹ Ug. *špš*, 'sun, Sun (as a DN)': DUL 836-8. Cf. the שמש: HALOT 1589-92; Ph., Pun., and Aram. *šmš*: DNWSI 1168 ff.; and Akk. *šamšu*: AHw 1158-9; CAD 17/1[Š] 335-8.

⁴² Ug. *yrḥ*, 'moon, Moon (DN), month': del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 979-80). Cf. Heb. ירח: HALOT 437-8; Ph., Pun., Aram. *yrḥ*: DNWSI 469-71; Akk. (w)arḫu: AHw 1466-7; CAD 1/2[A] 259-63. He is regarded as a (male) deity related to the moon: Wiggins (1998: 761); del Olmo-Sanmartín (*ibid.*: 979). Yarih may be regarded as a god in a higher position so that he is privileged to send a message to another (maybe through his own messengers): *ylak yrḥ nyr šmm 'm ḥr[h]b mlk qz*, 'Yarih, the Luminary of the heavens, sent (a message) to Har[ha]b King of circumcision (Ug. *qz*; Allan, 1999; followed by Wyatt, 2002: 338 and 336 n. 4; differently, 'Harvest': Watson, 1976b: 377; 'Summer': del Olmo-Sanmartín (*ibid.*: 722) (KTU 1.24.16-7). In addition, he appears to be served by a lesser deity: *tlš amt yrḥ*, 'Talish Maidservant of Yarih' (KTU 1.12 i 14-5). Wyatt (2002: 336) suggests that Yarih may be the Hurrian deity Kusuḥ, if the text reflects the Hurrian pantheon (Ginsberg, 1939).

⁴³ See *Enuma Elish* v. 2., where the stars are signified as images of the gods. Cf. Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 210).

⁴⁴ Ug. *kkbm*, 'star': UT §19.1189; WUS no. 1277; DUL 427-8. Cf. Akk. *kakkabu*: AHw 431; CAD 8[K] 45-9; Heb. כוכב: HALOT 463. Ug. *kkbm* occurs as a designation for a celestial sphere: KTU 1.1 iii 14; 1.3 iii 25; iv 17, 44; 1.5 ii 3; 1.7.32; 1.19 ii 3, 7; 1.19 iv 38; for a jewel: KTU 1.164.15; further for the deities in mythological texts: KTU 1.3 ii 41; 1.10 i 4; 1.13.13, 17; 1.19 iv 24-5, 31; 1.23.54; 1.43.3 (at this place, 'Sterngötter'; Dietrich-Loretz, 1992: 50; Wyatt, 2002: 358; differently, as a jewel, cf. del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 427-8); and perhaps, 1.92.27-8 (thus, *kkbm* ... *kkbt*, 'Star-gods ... Star-goddesses'; cf. Wyatt, 2002: 373 n. 25).

⁴⁵ For further discussion, cf. textual analyses of KTU 1.10 i 1-5 situated under the category of Genesis 3.5 in Part I of this chapter; also, cf. a discussion on Job 38.7 in Chapter V.

yš⁴⁷ly dğ⁴⁸thm b šmym he offered up⁴⁷ their⁴⁸ incense to the
Heavenly Ones;

dğ⁴⁹ hrnmy b kbkbm incense of Hrn⁴⁹m to the Stars.

In the description, the *ilm*, the *šmym*, and the *kbkbm* are paralleled. The last term is recognised as the designation of the celestial deities⁵⁰ in a paralleled construction with the *šmym*. The *šmym* and *kbkbm* are both identified as the *ilm*, 'gods'. The plurality of the gods appears also in the expression *ilm kbkbm*, 'star gods' (KTU 1.43.3).

1.9. *pħr m^{d51}* 'Assembly of the Council'

This pleonastic expression denotes the individual 'members of the pantheon in a formal assembly of the council' and is related to the 'motif of the divine council as a forensic medium for the operation of the divine will'⁵².

1.10. *sd* 'Council'

The term occurs as a hapax legomenon in the Ugaritic texts (KTU 1.20 i 4):

[tqr]b k qrb sd [They will approach⁵³] when the council⁵⁴
draws near⁵⁵.

⁴⁶ The D form of the Ug. \sqrt{qry} , to 'meet, encounter, go to meet; present, offer': DUL 714-5. Cf. Heb. קָרָה: HALOT 1137-8; Ar. *qarā*: AEL 2988.

⁴⁷ The Š form of the Ug. \sqrt{qy} , to 'go up, rise, raise, offer': DUL 159-60. Cf. Heb. עָלָה: HALOT 828-30; Ph., Pun. \sqrt{y} : DNWSI 852-3; Akk. *elû*: AHw 206-10; CAD 4[E] 114-35.

⁴⁸ The term is read possibly as *dğ⁴⁸thm* (KTU²); thus, 'their' (Wyatt, 2002: 309 n. 258) rather than 'his' (Parker, 1972: 101; de Moor, 1987: 260; Pardee, 1997: 355).

⁴⁹ Cf. Ug. *hrnmy* construed as the 'Hrn⁴⁹m-ite'(s) by Parker (1972: 101).

⁵⁰ Wyatt (2002: 309 n. 260).

⁵¹ It appears mostly in KTU 1.2: thus, six occurrences in 1.2 i 14-17, 20 (*pħr*, a mistake for *pħr*), and 31. Cf. Pardee (1997: 246 and n. 37): the 'Great Assembly'.

⁵² Wyatt (1998b: 45). For the council motif in the ancient Near East, see Jacobsen (1943: esp., 167-72); H.W. Robinson (1944); Cross (1953); Mullen (1980); Parker (1999a); and Wyatt (1996: 338-47).

Ug. *sd* may indicate the ‘assembly’ of the gods in the text of the *rpum*, whose meaning is variously suggested⁵⁶.

1.11. *šmym*⁵⁷ ‘Heavenly Ones’

This term is present in a parallelism with the *ilm* and *kbkbm* in KTU 1.19 iv 22-5 and 29-31, as discussed above. It may be an ‘epithetal form of *šmm*, “heaven(s)”’⁵⁸.

1.12. *šph ltpn* ‘Offspring of the Wise One’

The text of KTU 1.16 ii 43-4 (|| 1.16 i 22-23) mentions a plurality of the gods of the divine assembly:

<i>u ilm tmtn</i>	Or do the gods die ⁵⁹ ?
<i>šph ltpn l yh</i>	will the offspring of the Wise One ⁶⁰ not live ⁶¹ ?

The *šph ltpn*⁶² is constructed here in parallel with the *ilm*. Hence the text describes here the nature of the lesser deities as ‘supernatural beings’. It may

⁵³ The damaged letters reconstructed by de Moor-Spronk (1987: 119) are accepted here. Ug. *√qrb*: DUL 708-9.

⁵⁴ Ug. *sd*, ‘council’: Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 214); del Olmo (1981: 595); Dijkstra (1988: 39 n. 24); and DUL 753. Cf. the סדר, ‘council’: HALOT 745. Differently, Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 477): ‘secret (place)’.

⁵⁵ Wyatt (2002: 315).

⁵⁶ It shall be further discussed in the category of ‘Rapi’uma’ of Chapter IV.

⁵⁷ Cf. KTU 1.19 iv 24 and 30.

⁵⁸ Wyatt (1998b: 46).

⁵⁹ The 3. m. pl. form (Tropper, 2000: 644) of the Ug. *√mt*, to ‘die’ (UT §19.1443; WUS 1703; DUL 595-6). Cf. Heb. מָוֹת: HALOT 562-3; Aram. *mwt*: DNWSI 605-7; Amm., Pun. *mt*: DNWSI 605; and Akk. *mātu*: AHw 633-4; CAD 10/1[M] 421-7.

⁶⁰ For Ug. *ltpn*, see n. 324 below.

⁶¹ The 3. m. sg. form of the Ug. *√hwy*, to ‘live, be alive’ (Tropper, 2000: 660; DUL 379-80). Cf. Heb. חָיָה: HALOT 309-10; Aram. *hyh*: DNWSI 354-6.

be suggested from the text that the immortality of the gods was a theological perception of ancient Ugaritians, although the Ugaritic texts ironically present the idea that gods may die too⁶³.

1.13. Miscellaneous Ugaritic Titles

Various other terms are employed to indicate a group of deities: *ilm arš*, the 'gods of the *nether* land'⁶⁴; *ilm rbm*, the 'great gods'⁶⁵; and *ilnym*, the 'divine ones'⁶⁶, etc⁶⁷. More evidence for the plurality of divine beings may be suggested in diverse DN^s⁶⁸. In the Ugaritic pantheon lists, there appear distinguishably the principal gods and the peripheral gods⁶⁹. Hence it is

⁶² Its additional expression, *šph ltpn w qdš*, is used to refer to Keret as a divine king (KTU 1.16 i 9-11, 20-22; and 1.16 ii 48-9. We shall come back to the texts of KTU 1.16 i 9-11 again in Chapter 2 for a more detailed discussion.

⁶³ Hence, Yam (KTU 1.2 iv 32); Baal (KTU 1.5 v 10 – 1.5 vi 10); Mot (KTU 1.6 ii 30-37); and various minor gods (KTU 1.6 v 1-4).

⁶⁴ KTU 1.19 iii 6, [21], 35. These entities are identified as 'chthonian gods' (Wyatt, 1998b: 42; 2002: 304), who may be related to the 'divinised dead kings' in KTU 1.113 (Pardee, 1997: 353 n. 109), or to the *ilnym*, 'divinities' (Wyatt, 1998b: 42).

⁶⁵ The phrase occurs in KTU 1.107.2, 51; 1.124.1-2; and 4.149.1-2. Wyatt (1998b: 42) comments that they are perhaps a 'group of major deities rather than the whole pantheon', like Baal and Dagan, whose temples are located in the city of Ugarit.

⁶⁶ The *ilnym* may be related closely to the *rpum*, which occurs as a parallel (KTU 1.20 ii 1-2; 6-7). They may also refer to the dead and deified kings of Ugarit. See further discussion under 'Rapi'uma' in Chapter IV. Ug. *ilib* denotes also 'ancestral god': KTU 1.17 i 26 and parallels (KTU 1.47.2; || 1.118.1; cf. RS 20.24.1).

⁶⁷ Cf. Ug. *qbs(t)*, 'assembly', is used with a PN *dtn* in KTU 1.15 iii 4, 15; 1.161.3, 10 (*qbs ddn*, a variant of *dtn*). Ditan is generally regarded as a mythical ancestor of the Ugaritic dynasty: del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 283; *dt/dn* [I]). Differently, as an Assyrian royal PN: Gelb (1954: 210-30); as an Amor. *ditana(um)*, referred to Akk. *ditanum*, 'aurochs': Huffmon (1965: 184); Amor., but also found in Assyrian royal PNs: Healey (1978: 86); and referred to the Heb. דִּתָּן (Num 16.24) or to the *ditana*, seen in the Babylonian I royal PNs: Gordon (1965: §19.712). For other designations, see a classification of de Moor (1970: 224-5); followed reluctantly by Wyatt (1998b: 48-9).

⁶⁸ Cf. the pantheon lists described in KTU 1.47, paralleled in KTU 1.118 and RS 20.24.

⁶⁹ Cf. de Moor (1970: 216); Wyatt (1998b).

obvious that the ancient Ugaritians held the religious beliefs that there are lesser deities who serve their master gods in the divine assembly and that they are privileged to belong to the divine assembly as members⁷⁰, although they seem not to take any active role within it.

The primary function of the divine assembly/council in the ancient Near East is to discuss and make a decision about an issue⁷¹. In the Ugaritic texts, El presides over the divine council; especially in the Baal Cycle, the gods appear to have the freedom to raise objections⁷², or to make appeals⁷³, or to make proposals⁷⁴; consequently the final decision is made in the divine council⁷⁵. Similar situations in the divine assembly occur also in the Hebrew Bible⁷⁶.

Summary

Some collective Ugaritic nouns convey a conception of the plurality of the deities, including the lesser deities, which reflects the polytheistic and hierarchical beliefs of ancient Ugaritians. Thus, their divine identity is clarified through their titles: *ilm*. The membership of the lesser deities in the Ugaritic divine assembly is addressed in other divine titles: *il špn*, *bn il*, *dr il*, *dr dt šmm*, *pḥr ilm*, *‘dt ilm*, *pḥr kkbm*, *pḥr m‘d*, *sd* and *šmym*, etc. The

⁷⁰ Mullen (1980: 117).

⁷¹ Parker (1999a: 205). Cf. Enkidu’s address on the divine council in his last dream in the Gilgamesh Epic VII.i.1-16 (from the Hittite version; for its translation, see Heidel, 1963: 56-7); the supreme god Anu opens an issue to discuss in the divine council; Enlil expresses a proposition; Shamash objects to it; but Enlil rejects Shamash’s objection.

⁷² For instance, Baal rebukes Yam’s messengers and even attacks them, rejecting El’s decree of Yam’s sovereignty in the divine assembly: cf. KTU 1.2 i.

⁷³ Cf. the goddess Anat’s appeal for building the palace for Baal described in KTU 1.3 v 19-25.

⁷⁴ Athirat proposes Athtar as a candidate for king: KTU 1.6 i 53-55.

⁷⁵ A declaration is given in the council that Baal is the king of the divine assembly: KTU 1.4 iv 43-44.

⁷⁶ Cf. 1 Kgs 22.19-22; Isa 6; and 14.12-5.

Ugaritic texts describe some higher deities having their own lesser deities, who serve them. The Ugaritic expression *phr b^cl* denotes a 'group of lesser deities of Baal', most likely the *il t^cdr*, 'Helper-gods' of Baal, who can be suggested as 'seven Lads; eight Boars' in KTU 1.5 v 8-9. In the Ugaritic texts, some other terms are adopted also to designate the divine beings: *ilm arš*, *ilm rbm*, and *ilnym*.

2. Position of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Ugaritic Texts

With the application of the definitions and conceptions of the divine titles of the lesser deities, the present study henceforth will seek to give an account of how the hierarchical divine assembly is structured and how the position of the lesser deities, ranked as the lowest level in the hierarchical divine assembly, is described in the Ugaritic texts.

2.1. Hierarchical Structure of the Divine Assembly in the Ugaritic Texts

It is important to explore the diversity among heavenly beings through an analysis of how the hierarchical divine assembly is formed in order to delineate the position of the lesser deities ranked as the lowest level in the pantheon.

2.1.1. A View of the Divine Assembly on Three Levels

In Ugaritic mythology it has been postulated that the divine assembly consists of three primary groups of deities. In the Keret Epic the phrase '*dt ilm tlth*' has been regarded as the expression of the hierarchical structure of the divine assembly. The text runs:

[] *tr* [] Bull⁷⁷,

⁷⁷ Sc. 'El'. A bull-image is used to describe the figure of El through the title *tr il*, 'Bull El': KTU 1.1 iii 26, 1.2 iii 19, and 1.17 i 23, etc.

[aliyn]n b ⁹¹	[the Might]iest ⁷⁸ Baal,
[]mn yr ^h zbl	[] Prince ⁷⁹ Yarih,
[k]tr w hss	[Ko]thar-and-Hasis ⁸⁰ ,
[]xn r ^h my ršp zbl	[] Rahmay ⁸¹ , Prince Reshef ⁸² ,
[w] ʿdt ilm tlth	[and] the assembly of the gods in threes

(KTU 1.15 ii 2-7).

Whereas Virolleaud understands the last term *tlth* as an indication of a trinity of gods⁸³, Ginsberg takes it as ‘threefold’⁸⁴. Gaster observes that the deities in the list above are three pairs; collectively, ‘in its tripartite division’;

⁷⁸ Gibson (1978: 90, 141); M.S. Smith (1997: 123). Ug. *aliyn* is commonly construed as an elative form of the \sqrt{l}^y , to ‘be strong’ (Pope, 1965a: 254; *UT* §19.1342; and *WUS* no. 1430; cf. Akk. *lēʾû*, to ‘be able, capable, skilled’: *AHw* 546-7; *CAD* 9[L] 160-1); G.R. Driver (1956: 136); del Olmo (1981: 513); followed by Wyatt (1992a: 405); thus, the ‘very/most powerful’: Herdner (1974: 537); *DUL* 53. Cf. ‘puissant’: Gaster (1961: 188); Ginsberg (1969: 138); ‘Mighty’: Gray (1965: 164); Pardee (1997: 337); and ‘Almighty’: Clear (1976: 40); Greenstein (1997: 24). For various translations, cf. the ‘victor’: G.R. Driver (*ibid.*: 37, 136); Habel (1964: 100); ‘erhabener’: Jirku (1962: 58); and ‘Valiant’: Wyatt (2002: 206); and for further discussion, cf. van Zijl (1972: 341-5).

⁷⁹ Ug. *zbl*: *DUL* 998 (I). It may be one of the designations for the ‘second’ position of the gods.

⁸⁰ Kothar-and-Hasis is a craftsman god: cf. M.S. Smith (1985).

⁸¹ Whilst Gaster (1947a: 287), Gray (1964a: 58), and M.S. Smith (1994: 170 n. 100) identify Rahmay (derived from Ug. *r^hm*, ‘womb’: cf. de Moor, 1972: [2] 18 n. 62; 1980b: 306; also cf. Wyatt, 2002: 327 n. 16: thus, ‘uterine, wombly’) with the goddess Anat, others consider that it is a partner of the goddess Athirat: Cross (1973: 49 n. 23); Wyatt (2002: 207 n. 136). Two goddesses, Rahmay and Athirat, probably represent hypostases of Shapsh in KTU 1.23.13: Wyatt (2002: 324-5; 327 n. 16; cf. 206 n. 135). Cf. Wyatt (1994a: 144 n. 9): Shapsh and Asherah (Athirat) are “double aspects of the sun-goddess necessitated by the cosmological and mythological demands of the narrative”. For further notes, cf. Pardee (1997: 278 n. 22).

⁸² This underworld deity, known as a god of pestilence (Pope-Röllig, 1965b: 305; del Olmo-Sanmartín, 2004: 747), is evidently attested in Egyptian and Semitic religious traditions: Fulco (1976).

⁸³ Virolleaud (1942-3: 143): “dans sa trinité”. This is denied by Gray (1964a: 58) since “more gods than three are indicated”.

⁸⁴ Ginsberg (1946: 22); also, Gordon (1949: 74).

thus they represent the structure of the Ugaritic pantheon: Baal and Prince Moon as gods of heaven (supernal deities), Prince Reshef as a god of the netherworld (subterranean deity), and Kothar-and-Hasis as a god associated with the sea (marine deity)⁸⁵. Driver thinks of a third rank of the divine assembly at this place⁸⁶. Gray translates it as 'three categories thereof'⁸⁷, identifying the divine assembly as having three different layers "possibly corresponding to three different stages of settlement and cultural development at Ugarit"⁸⁸. Agreeing with Gray, Gibson additionally notes that it means "'the three-fold company', referring to ranks or divisions within the pantheon"⁸⁹. Whilst Herdner interprets *-h* on *tl̄t* as a pronominal ending⁹⁰, de Moor and Spronk regard the term *tl̄t* as cardinal; thus, 'in its triplicity'⁹¹. De Moor characterizes the divine assembly as tripartite: firstly, "older gods like El and his wife, Athirat (*atrt*)"; secondly, "their offspring: 'the family of El'/'sons of Athirat'"; and thirdly, "the newcomers around Baal, the so-called 'Congregation of Baal'"⁹².

However, the paradigm of divine hierarchy seems to be not simple but intricate. The story of divine conflict addresses how the high group of the gods is struggling to occupy the absolute power of the divine assembly. Thus, Peterson and Woodward try to explain the knotty relational structure of the

⁸⁵ Gaster (1947a: 287-8): thus, translated as the 'company of the gods in its tripartite division'; cf. 'in ihrer Dreizahl': Jirku (1962: 96 and n. 2); here, Jirku and Virolleaud (1942-3: 143) refer the suffix of the term to the assembly of the gods. This view is rejected by Gray (1964a: 58) for it is a "hazardous conjecture in such a fragmentary text".

⁸⁶ G.R. Driver (1956: 37): 'the third thereof'.

⁸⁷ Gray (1964a: 18).

⁸⁸ Gray (1964a: 58).

⁸⁹ Gibson (1978: 91 n. 2).

⁹⁰ Herdner (1974: 537; and cf. n. f.): '*ses triades*'.

⁹¹ De Moor-Spronk (1982b: 174); also, de Moor (1987: 205). Cf. de Moor-Spronk (1982a: 171): "it is possible to replace multiplicatives by simple cardinal numbers" in Akk., Heb., and Ar.

⁹² De Moor (1987: 205 n. 47).

hegemony of the Ugaritic pantheon in some isomorphic graphs⁹³. They differentiate between the complicated hierarchical structure of the Ugaritic pantheon and the simplified one in the Hebrew Bible, and then claim that a tripartite shape of divine sovereignty has been acknowledged in the Ugaritic world: El (the 'supreme king'), Baal (the 'king of the heavens'), and Anat⁹⁴.

Wyatt confutes this view with various points. First, their analysis is restricted only to the Baal Cycle (KTU 1.1-6)⁹⁵; thus, it cannot be the full picture⁹⁶. Secondly, it is doubtful if Anat, as an autonomous deity, is in such a minor position: one of the tripartite levels of the cosmic power; Anat rather, as a war goddess, takes the same level as Baal. And lastly, Wyatt points out that the structure of biblical cosmology is not simple, as viewed only on one level; for comparison with the Ugaritic one, it is oversimplified⁹⁷.

In fact, the context of KTU 1.15 ii above is the wedding reception of King Keret. Thus, del Olmo reads the lines as a list of divine recipients of Keret's sacrifices⁹⁸. The gods in the divine assembly are apparently invited as the divine guests to participate in the ceremony. Hence it can be suggested that the invitees on that occasion may be the entire membership of the divine assembly, including even the lesser deities who serve their master gods, to highly honour King Keret.

⁹³ Peterson-Woodward (1977: 233-43).

⁹⁴ Peterson-Woodward (1977: 242).

⁹⁵ The Ugaritic myth is usually divided into the Baal Cycle, the stories of Keret (KTU 1.14-16), Aqhat (1.17-19) and some minor compositions such as the Gracious gods (KTU 1.23), Nikkal (KTU 1.24), El's marzihu (KTU 1.114), etc.

⁹⁶ Wyatt (1996: 21) remarks that the excavated Ugaritic texts remain "no more than about 50% of the original".

⁹⁷ Wyatt (1996: 21).

⁹⁸ Del Olmo (1981: 303).

Margalit interprets *-h* on *tl̥t* as an adverbial ending; thus, 'in threes'⁹⁹; according to him, it may signify that the 'assembly of the "sons of El", representing the anonymous "younger generation", are escorting each other in triads'¹⁰⁰ since the 'chief' gods, in advance, arrive in pairs (KTU 1.15 ii 2-6). However, it is not certain whether the 'chief' gods have arrived in pairs because of the fragmentary nature of the Ugaritic tablets.

Apparently, the phrase *'dt ilm tl̥th* might be translated as the 'assembly of the gods; its Triple' indicating that divine guests are coming from the whole tripartite pantheon¹⁰¹ inasmuch as all its members are probably invoked by Keret to appear at the marriage festival. However, it is better understood in the context as a moving formation of the 'assembly of the gods' by threes. As Margalit said, the *'dt ilm* at this place could be identified as anonymous 'lesser' deities for the higher gods who had arrived in advance:

[aḥ]r mgy *'dt ilm* [After]wards¹⁰² the assembly of the gods
arrived¹⁰³

⁹⁹ This was first suggested by Ginsberg (1946: 40), interpreting it as an adverbial *-h*. Wyatt (2002: 206 and n. 136) followed.

¹⁰⁰ Margalit (1995: 241-2).

¹⁰¹ In this point, Ug. *-h* may be understood as a possessive pronominal suffix.

¹⁰² In the previous lines it is described that Keret serves a feast (KTU 1.15 ii 8-10). Ug. *aḥr* can be used either as an adverb 'afterwards' or as a conjunction 'after': *DUL* 39-40. It may be used here as an adverb: G.R. Driver (1956: 37); Gibson (1978: 91); and Wyatt (2002: 207). It may suppose that all members of the assembly of the gods have not arrived at the feast of Keret in his house, and that the rest of them, probably the lesser deities, are still coming for the feast.

¹⁰³ Ug. *mgy*; to 'reach, come, arrive': *UT* §19.1520; *DUL* 533. For possible cognates, cf. Heb. מָגַץ (*DCH* 5: 434-42); Ph. *mšʿ* (*DNWSI* 675); Akk. *maṣû* (*AHw* 621-2; *CAD* 10/1[M] 344 - 50; and cf. *UT* §19.1520); and Ar. *maḍâ*, to 'go' (G.R. Driver, 1956: 160 n. 1; *AEL* 3021; and Al-Yasin, 1952: no. 365). Al-Yasin comments that 'the diverse representation of the *ḡ* indicates either a vacillation or possibly the existence of a Semitic phoneme not fully recognizable in Ugaritic and entirely lost in Arabic'. Ug. *mgy* is a *qatala* verb, which conveys a 'continuous state in which an acting person is placed by his own action' (Goetze, 1938: 275), and which

It seems probable that their arrival after all the higher gods represents their rank as the lowest level subjects, demonstrating their subservient status under the supreme gods and the secondary gods in the divine assembly. Therefore their march following the higher gods may signify their lesser status as divine assistants or servitors to the higher gods.

Another interesting issue concerns the privilege of the lesser gods to bless a mortal. It seems evident that the right to bless a mortal belongs even to the lesser deities. After serving a banquet for the gods, Keret is blessed by them:

<i>tbrk ilm tity</i>	The gods blessed ¹⁰⁴ (him and) went ¹⁰⁵ ;
<i>tity ilm l ahlhm</i>	the gods went to their tents ¹⁰⁶ ;
<i>dr il l mšknthm</i>	the (family) circle of El to their abodes ¹⁰⁷

indicates a 'state of rest that results from the movement' (*ibid.*); followed by van Zijl (1972: 84; also, for his comments on Ug. *mgy*, cf. 84-5). Cf. *ik mgy aliyn b'l ik mgyt b[t]lt ʿnt*, 'Why has Mightiest Baal come? Why has V[ir]gin Anat come?' (KTU 1.4 ii 21-4; for textual analyses, see Chapter II). It may support the fact that the gods have arrived not simultaneously, but continually during the feast.

¹⁰⁴ The 3. masc. pl. form of the Ug. \sqrt{brk} , to 'bless': DUL 237 (II). Cf. Heb. בָּרַךְ: HALOT 159-60; Ph., Pun., and Aram. *brk*: DNWSI 198-202; Akk. *kārabu*: AHw 445-6; CAD 8[K] 192-8.

¹⁰⁵ The 3. masc. pl. form of the Ug. \sqrt{tw} , to 'come, go': Tropper (2000: 658); DUL 123. Cf. Heb. אָחַז (or אָחַז): HALOT 102; Aram. ܐܝܬܝ: DNWSI 133-6. The term denotes the departure of the gods from the Keret's house towards their own residences.

¹⁰⁶ Ug. *ahl*, 'tent', with pronominal pl. suff: DUL 32. Wyatt (2002: 212 n. 158) argues that 'though the gods of Ugarit dwelt in temples, the ancient tradition of their tent-dwelling is preserved': cf. Ug. *hmt*, 'tent (shrine)' at KT U 1.14 ii [12]; 1.14 iii 55; El's tent (KTU 1.4 iv 23-4); Heb. מִשְׁכָּן, 'tabernacle', and Heb. חֹמֶת, as a 'cultic tent' at Ps 19.7 (Wyatt, 1995b: 571-2). Ug. *ahl* is used as the semantic equivalent of the term *mškn* in the third line. In 2 Sam 7.6, Heb. אֹהֶל, 'tent', is paralleled with Heb. מִשְׁכָּן, 'dwelling place, tabernacle', contrasting with a notion of Heb. בַּיִת, 'house'.

¹⁰⁷ Ug. *mšknthm*; a f. form from the Ug. $\sqrt{škn}$, to 'settle, stay', with a prefixed *-m* and a pronominal pl. suff.; 'residence, mansion': DUL 591. Wyatt (1996: 28 n. 18; 2002: 212-3 n. 158) remarks that Ug. *mšknthm* corresponds to Heb. מִשְׁכָּן; both have a similar tradition of the tent-dwelling of the gods.

Macdonald assigns a list of the gods in KTU 1.15 ii 1-6 (Bull [El], Baal, Prince Moon, Kothar-and-Hasis, Rahmay, and Prince Reshef) to the "third part of the congregation of the gods" and believes they are the ones who bless Keret¹⁰⁸.

In the Ugaritic texts, however, there is no mention of the secondary gods having cooperated to bless a mortal. If Baal has not participated in the blessing, other secondary gods may not have done so either for he is regarded as the mightiest or eldest god among the secondary gods. For this fact, de Moor states that 'El is the only one who can bless people with children. No other god, not even Baal, is able to do that. El is called "King" (*mlk*), "Lord of the Gods" (*'adn 'ilm*) and possibly also "Most High" (*'lyn*)'¹⁰⁹.

Yet, the Ugaritic descriptions rather state that the gods who have given a blessing to Keret were not only El (KTU 1.15 ii 17-20), at the request of Baal (KTU 1.15 ii 12-6), but also his sons, who belong to the family 'circle of El' (*dr il*). The *dr il* in line 19, paralleled semantically with the *'dt ilm* (KTU 1.15 ii 7, 11) and *ilm* (KTU 1.15 iii 17, 18), indicates, more probably, only the anonymous lesser deities of El. It may be suggested here that the lesser deities of El are more privileged than the secondary gods.

More evidence of the fact that the lesser deities are privileged to bless others is found in a hymn to Anat in KTU 1.13. It is generally regarded that a personal prayer (KTU 1.13.23b-27a) follows the previous mythical part of the hymnic text to the goddess Anat (KTU 1.13.1-23a)¹¹⁰. In the descriptions, the

¹⁰⁸ Macdonald (1979: 523-4): the *'dt ilm ilth* in line 7 is "in apposition to the foregoing"; "the purpose of this small 'assembly' is the bestowal of blessing on Krt".

¹⁰⁹ De Moor (1990: 69).

¹¹⁰ De Moor (1987: 137).

goddess is expressed as the receiver of the prayer in the 2nd person or feminine indications¹¹¹, and described as blessed by celestial messengers:

k d lbšt bir mlak šmm tmr zbl

Since you¹¹² have been

clothed¹¹³ in light, may¹¹⁴ the

messengers of the heavens

bless¹¹⁵ the prince;

ml<a>k šmm tlak ḥl

may the messengers¹¹⁶ of the

heavens send (you)

strength¹¹⁷

(KTU 1.13.25-7).

The text has been read variously: *mlak šmm tmr, zbl mlk šmm tlak*, 'heavenly messengers left; heavenly royal princes sent'¹¹⁸; or *tmr zbl mlk*, 'puisses-tu

¹¹¹ Ug. *b udnk* 'in your ear'; *rtqt* 'you have bound up' and *lbšt* (KTU 1.13.23-5).

¹¹² Sc. 'Anat'.

¹¹³ Ug. *lbšt*; the pass. ptc. f. form of the Ug. $\sqrt{lbš}$, to 'dress, wear, put on clothes': DUL 492.

¹¹⁴ It is translated in a jussive mood: Wyatt (2002: 172).

¹¹⁵ The G. 3. masc. pl. form of the Ug. \sqrt{mrr} , to 'strengthen, bless': Al-Yasin (1952: no. 374), referring to Ar. *mirratun*, 'strength' (cf. Ar. *marīr*: AEL 2701); UT §19.1556; Dietrich-Loretz-Sanmartín (1973); WUS no. 1659; Gibson (1978: 152); Kutler (1984); Segert (1997: 193); Tropper (2000: 673). For a translation of 'to bless', see Caquot (1989: 26 and n. 33): "Sur le verbe *mr(r)*, bien attesté à Ougarit avec le sens de «bénir», mais traduit par certains «fortifier»"; Wyatt (2002: 212). It is also preferably utilised as 'to strengthen': Rin (1968: xli); de Moor (1980b: 306); to 'fortify': de Moor (1987: 140 and n. 37); de Moor-Spronk (1987: 152); cf. to 'defend': Gordon (1949: 52). For different readings, see 'to drive out': Pardee (1978a: 257 and n. 52); to 'leave': del Olmo (1981: 493; 1984b: 99); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 577 [I]).

¹¹⁶ CTA and KTU¹⁺²: *mlk*. The text is read, more probably, as *ml<a>k*, following the previous colon: de Moor (1980b: 306); CARTU 58; Lloyd (1994: 280); and Wyatt (2002: 172). It may be haplography.

¹¹⁷ The first element of the term is damaged. CTA reads it as *tl*, 'dew' (DUL 889); yet it seems rather to be *hl*, following KTU¹⁺²; thus, 'strength, vigour' (DUL 359 [I]); cf. Heb. חֵל, חֵיל.

¹¹⁸ Del Olmo (1981: 493; 1984b: 99); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 487).

bénir le prince, le roi'¹¹⁹; or *šmm tmr zbl mlk, šmm tlak hl amr*¹²⁰. However, it is more probable that the *mlak šmm/ml<a>k šmm*¹²¹ are taken here as the subjects of two verbs, *tlak* and *tmr*. Thus the supposed third line above, *ml<a>k šmm tlak hl*, becomes more explicable when it is seen as the paralleled structure with the previous line, *mlak šmm tmr zbl*. Hence it can be suggested that the Ugaritians had a theology that messengers from the heavens (or from the divine assembly) are charged with various missions beyond their basic function as a 'messenger'¹²². Therefore it may support the fact that the gods in KTU 1.15 iii 17-9 are identified as the lesser deities in regard to their 'blessing' function.

On the other hand, Rin suggests that Ug. *tlth* at KTU 1.15 ii 7 may possibly refer to 'Baal's companions or guards', comparing its Heb. cognate שלישין, 'his lieutenants' or 'his retinue'¹²³; the Heb. שליש denotes 'third' or '(military) officer', which may be construed as the 'third' man (in the chariot)¹²⁴.

Wyatt orally suggested that Ug. *tl̥t* is interpreted possibly as a military title, on the basis of KTU 1.14 ii 36: sc. 'charioteer'; thus, the "'third man' in the chariot, of the team of three"¹²⁵. Ug. *tlth* in the text may include Baal's

¹¹⁹ Caquot (1989: 26). According to him, the subject of the verb (2. f. sg.) is Anat. Cf. Caquot (1978: 18): 'puisses-tu bénir le pouvoir du roi'.

¹²⁰ CPU 786, 1315.

¹²¹ Cf. מלאך יהוה מן השמים, at Gen 22.11, which the element יהוה perhaps had been loaded later in the original text.

¹²² For discussion on the various functions of the lesser deities, see Chapter V.

¹²³ Rin (1968: xli).

¹²⁴ Brown-Driver-Briggs (BDB 1026) contend that the שליש indicates a king's 'personal attendant' or 'military officer'.

¹²⁵ Wyatt (2002: 190 n. 62; also, cf. 185 n.38). The ancient chariot was a two-wheeled vehicle, whose box itself was open at the back, and usually manned by three soldiers: a driver, a combatant, and an armour bearer. Cf. de Vaux (1961: 222-3).

'charioteers' being his 'Boars' (Ug. *hnr*)¹²⁶; but it seems to signify not a subordinate group of a specific god, but rather all lesser deities of the divine assembly, occurring after the lists of the higher gods.

Rin understands that all of the '*dt ilm*', 'the assembly of gods', the '*glmm*', 'Lads'¹²⁷, and the '*tl*', 'lieutenants', are the 'warriors accompanying a chief deity'¹²⁸. Although his explanation of the '*tlh*' as Baal's lesser deities is unconvincing, his recognition of the term relating to a military conception appears to be to his credit. Thus the term may bring up the image of the military marching pattern 'in threes' of the lowest group of the divine assembly.

2.1.2. A Socio-political View of the Divine Assembly in Four Groups

Meanwhile the structure of the divine assembly may contain the socio-political hierarchy inasmuch as, in Ugaritic religion, the divine assembly reflects a political ideology developed within the human realm¹²⁹. Handy classifies the divine assembly in four groups on the basis of a modern criterion: 'authoritative deities' (El and Asherah [Athirat]); 'active deities' (Baal, Anat, Mot, and Shemesh/Shapshu); 'artisan deities' (Kothar-wa-Hasis, *et al.*); and 'messenger deities' (*mlakm*)¹³⁰.

Yet, the position of Athirat is not clearly attested as such an exalted one in the Ugaritic texts, although she appears as the mother goddess of the gods, such as Baal, Mot, *et al.* Also, there seems to be no great difference between artisan deities and messenger deities. As an alternative, they may be

¹²⁶ For Baal's Boars, cf. Wyatt (1987b). We will discuss further about Ug. *hnr* in the category of the Ugaritic titles for warrior deities in Chapter IV.

¹²⁷ We shall discuss the military function of the *glm* later in Chapter IV.

¹²⁸ Rin (1968: xli).

¹²⁹ Cf. Mullen (1992: 214); Handy (1994: 65): his understanding of the 'pantheon as a bureaucracy' presupposes a hierarchical structure. Also, cf. Wyatt (1998b: 31-2).

¹³⁰ See Handy (1990; 1994). Cf. Wyatt (2002: 206 n. 136).

all grouped into 'lesser deities' or 'servant deities' in the hierarchical division. Besides, the roles of lesser deities appear more variously.

2.1.3. Hierarchical Structure of the Divine Assembly in Four Levels

As an alternative, the structure of the divine assembly can be arranged, with ranks distinguished among the deities, into four levels¹³¹: the supreme god (El), core-involved secondary gods (Baal, Yam, Mot, *et al.*), other peripheral secondary gods (Kothar-and-Hasis, *et al.*), and other anonymous lesser deities who serve the higher gods. Among them some special lesser deities, whose own epithets are given, may be distinguished from other ordinary lesser deities. These entities may be related, possibly, to the archangels in the Hebrew Bible, perhaps as their prototype.

Summary

The hierarchical structure of the Ugaritic divine assembly has been proposed by most commentators commonly to consist of three levels or by Handy four groups (namely, authoritative deities; active deities; artisan deities; and messenger deities). This is best understood as four levels, with hierarchical ranks distinguished among the deities: sc. the supreme god (El), who has the cosmic divine kingship; core-involved second gods (Yam, Baal, Mot, *et al.*), who are related closer to the divine kingship; peripheral second gods; and other lesser deities, who serve the higher deities, including messenger deities, warrior deities, mediator deities, guardian deities, chanter deities, and

¹³¹ The nonverbal indicators as well as the closeness of the deities to the divine throne in the cosmic centre may be suggested here as the criterion for determining hierarchical ranks among the deities. M.I. Gruber (1980) emphasises that nonverbal communication, especially postures, gestures and facial expressions, explains the characters' inner emotions, which are not described in verbal terms: 'prostrating (oneself)' or 'standing' (in front of others), etc. It is accepted by Kruger (1995: 169), who says that psychological states of the characters 'in the epic' can be understood by their nonverbal communication.

servant deities. The lesser deities are positioned on the lowest level of the divine assembly.

2.2. Ranks of Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Ugaritic Texts

2.2.1. Supreme God

El appears as the divine king of the heavenly court. Smith says that nonverbal indicators, the patterns of travel by deities and their prostration before other gods, indicates rank among the gods in the divine assembly¹³²; to this point, El can be regarded as the supreme god in the divine assembly because he never travels to any other gods whereas all the gods travel to his abode, nor does he pay homage, or make a plea to others¹³³. In the Ugaritic texts, El is understood as the 'ultimate authority in the cosmos'¹³⁴; he rules in heaven on the mountain of the divine assembly; he makes proclamations to other deities¹³⁵.

¹³² M.S. Smith (1984). In the Hebrew texts, a gesture of 'bending over' (השחחיה), in the secondary sense, denotes an attitude of greeting or giving homage to others; see, Gruber (1980: 90-123; especially, 187-200 and 292-301); therefore prostration is related to the rank of mortals or deities. In fact, lesser deities are obliged to follow a strict protocol before stating terms to the higher gods. See discussion under the category of 'showing homage to the divine recipient' in Chapter III.

¹³³ Cf. M.S. Smith (1984); Kruger (1989: 56-7; 1995: 170). In the Baal Cycle it is described how El receives obeisance from other gods: Kothar (KTU 1.1 iii 25; 1.2 iii 6); Anat (KTU 1.4 iv 26; 1.6 i 38 and 1.17 vi 50, which occurs as a parallel in KTU 1.4 iv 20-6, etc.). Wyatt (1995c: 123-42) argues that deities do not 'travel vast distances in their mutual interaction' for 'all the different mountains' are 'aspects of the one central cosmic mountain', Saphon, the centre of the world. Cf. Wyatt (1996: 27-48).

¹³⁴ L'Heureux (1979: 5).

¹³⁵ Cf. KTU 1.1 iv; 1.3 v; 1.4 iv-v; and 1.6 iii.

2.2.2. Core-involved Second Gods

Some secondary gods are positioned closely to the throne of the supreme god. In fact, the theme of the Ugaritic mythological texts deals mainly with kingship within the divine assembly¹³⁶. Although El is recognised as the supreme god, his throne is in turn occupied by other royal gods, who are acknowledged generally as the next highest ranking gods: Yam¹³⁷, Baal¹³⁸, and Mot¹³⁹, who can be categorised largely as the core-involved 'secondary gods'¹⁴⁰. They execute royal power 'under the aegis of El'¹⁴¹.

In the episode of the banquet at Mount Saphon¹⁴², for instance, the position of Baal may indicate his rank in the divine assembly:

¹³⁶ Wyatt (1996).

¹³⁷ Cf. KTU 1.1 iv; and the *ksi zbl ym*, the 'throne of Prince Yam' (KTU 1.2 iv 7).

¹³⁸ As a king among the gods: KTU 1.3 v 32-4; 1.4 iv 43-6.

¹³⁹ Mot is mentioned as a king in KTU 1.6 vi 27-9. He appears to dwell in the underworld (cf. KTU 1.4 viii).

¹⁴⁰ There are, in fact, other secondary gods who seem to be outside the intra-pantheonic conflicts: Kothar-and-Hasis, *et al.* Wyatt (2002: 140 n. 27) says that in KTU 1.1-1.6 the god Athtar appears to be on a lower level than other secondary gods. Wyatt (1986a; 1989; and 2002: 132, n. 75) argues that the enthronement of Athtar (KTU 1.6 i 39-67) represents the human institution of terrestrial kingship; thus, Athtar signifies a 'tertiary level, the human world, whose institutions are subject to pressures from above and below'. Therefore, he is 'on a lower level' distant from other second gods: Wyatt (2002: 140 n. 103). Therefore, there are two kinds of second-level gods: 'core-involved' gods in divine conflicts for the throne and others. Apparently the authority of the secondary gods is restricted: according to KTU 1.18, Anat has to get permission from El in advance to perform her plan against the mortal hero Aqhat. Cf. Job 2.6.

¹⁴¹ Wyatt (2002: 140 n. 103).

¹⁴² Its alternate title is the *gr ks*, 'Mount Throne' (KTU 1.1 iii 12; also, 1.161.13, 20; on the etymological debate, see Wyatt (1995a; esp. 222-4); or it could be a "constituent part of the massif" (Wyatt, 1996: 37). The answer to the question, 'Why is "Saphon" called "Throne"?', can be inferred from the fact that the mountain is the 'centre' of the world, where the supreme god El is supposed to *sit* to rule. In KTU 1.1, it can be suggested that there would be a royal rite which transmits El's authority to his son Yam in a lacuna between the two columns iii and iv of the tablet; throughout the narrative sequence, Yam

Although there is no direct mention of Ug. *ks*, 'chair', in the narrative, it is not unusual to refer to the position of the host at the banquet as being seated on the chair or the throne¹⁴⁵. His supposed sitting position is distinguished from Baal's standing position.

A standing posture (*'md*, *qwm*) may indicate one's lesser rank. Gruber argues that a deity's standing posture expresses equal status between deities¹⁴⁶. But it may be correct only if they both are standing. In the cases in which he gives examples (KTU 1.2 i 13-7, 30-2), however, the messenger deities stood after they had prostrated themselves toward El¹⁴⁷. Oldenburg

certainly succeeded to the throne of his father, El; thus, at any rate, the power of the throne was transmitted to Yam.

However, the throne ultimately seems to belong to El; hence, Wyatt (1996: 36) remarks that in spite of the "struggle of the secondary gods for the throne", "in the Ugaritic tradition it appears to remain subordinated to El's final control". It seems in Ugaritic political ideology that any successor should come up to the throne of his predecessor for the complete succession of the regal right; cf. Wyatt (1996: 36, 42). Thus, Mount Throne expresses the cosmic sovereignty of the supreme god. Wyatt (2002: 44 n. 29) cogently identifies Mount Throne with the "throne in the city on which the kings of Ugarit were consecrated" and argues interestingly that it indicates also Nan (KTU 1.16 i 8) as Anti-Casius, the southwestern lower peak of the Jebel el Aqra massif: also, see Wyatt (1996: 34-44, 2002: 220 n. 200).

¹⁴³ Ug. *qm*, to 'stand up, get up, rise': UT §19.2214; WUS no. 2417; DUL 702. Cf. Heb. קָם: HALOT 1086-9; Akk. *qamû*: AHW 896-7.

¹⁴⁴ Ug. ḡ has been translated variously: 'by' (de Moor, 1971: 124; Gibson, 1978: 41; Wyatt, 2002: 60); 'beside' (Clear, 1976: 4; Mullen, 1980: 256); 'upon' (Ginsberg, 1969: 130); 'on' (M.S. Smith, 1994: 266). Differently, 'before' (Gordon, 1949: 13; van Zijl, 1972: 25); 'against' (Oldenburg, 1969: 135; Caquot-Sznycer, 1974: 130).

¹⁴⁵ Moreover, the description states that other gods (*bn qdš*) were sitting (*yṯb*) on the chair for the banquet (KTU 1.2 i 21).

¹⁴⁶ Gruber (1980: 301-3).

¹⁴⁷ We shall discuss more on the texts in Chapter III. Furthermore, a relief excavated from Ras Shamra shows that any of lesser rank should stand before the supreme god:

argues that Baal was attempting to arrogate El's position and power; thus he translates the line as 'Ba'al was rising against El'¹⁴⁸. Yet Baal appears to be subservient to El, as seen in the text¹⁴⁹.

Thus it is more acceptable that Baal was standing up in order to express his subordinate rank¹⁵⁰; it would be the correct place for him as a prince, next to the cosmic king *sitting on the throne* in the centre of the world¹⁵¹. It is obvious also that Athtart and Anat as well as Baal were standing close to the throne of El as they got involved seizing Baal's hands when Baal attacked Yam's messengers (KTU 1.2 i 40-2)¹⁵².

2.2.3. Peripheral Second Gods

Even if the gods in the same rank do not pay homage to one another¹⁵³, in some cases, gods not 'core-involved' in the divine conflicts for the throne pay homage to the 'core-involved' gods: Baal is worshipped 'verbally' by Kothar-and-Hasis (KTU 1.2 iv) during his enthronement.

Schaeffer (1937: pl. 17; cf. 128-134; and the figure I on p. 129); *ANEP* no. 493; a deity supposed as El is sitting on the chair receiving an offering from a king or a high priest.

¹⁴⁸ Oldenburg (1969: 135 and n. 3).

¹⁴⁹ Mullen (1980: 256 n. 232) says acceptably that 'Baal was bound by the decree of 'Ēl, as were the other gods'; accepted by Kruger (1989: 59).

¹⁵⁰ Kruger (1995: 170) points out that Baal's posture as 'standing by El' means nonverbally his 'subservience' to El; also, cf. Kruger (1989: 58-60).

¹⁵¹ A royal prince is positioned usually in the nearest place from the king in an official ceremony; cf. *ANEP* no. 463; Prince Xerxes is standing behind King Darius. Also cf. Acts 7:55-6.

¹⁵² It is suggested that a gesture of grasping the hem of a person's garment can be a nonverbal sign of rank differences between gods as well: hence, Anat, making a petition for Baal, appears to be inferior to Mot (KTU 1.6 ii 6-12): Kruger (1995: 170-2). Yet, the context of the text remains doubtful if Anat did it that way. It may be interpreted simply as her gesture of asking for Mot's sympathy.

¹⁵³ Kruger (1995: 170).

2.2.4. Lesser Deities Who Serve the Higher Deities

The deities who serve these high ranking gods belong to the lowest group in the divine hierarchy¹⁵⁴. Therefore divine messengers pay homage to any other gods of higher rank before they deliver a message, except when they bring the 'war message'¹⁵⁵; meanwhile, the higher gods do not honour divine messengers¹⁵⁶.

Summary

The rank of the lesser deities in the divine assembly in the Ugaritic texts is discerned as the lowest level in the hierarchical structure of the Ugaritic divine assembly. The hierarchy of the Ugaritic divine assembly is divided largely into four levels: the supreme god, the second gods mainly involved in the divine kingship of the divine assembly, the peripheral second gods, and the lesser deities who serve the higher deities. These ranks among the deities may be distinguished by nonverbal indicators.

Conclusion to Chapter I, Part I

The membership of the lesser deities in the divine assembly in the Ugaritic texts is understood in collective Ugaritic nouns (e.g., *ilm*, *dr il*, *dr dt šmm*, etc.) and in the hierarchical structure of the Ugaritic divine assembly, which can be divided into four levels. The lesser deities are in the lowest rank in the divine assembly.

¹⁵⁴ El's messenger deities are 'his agents, the lesser gods of the pantheon as in effect hypostases of himself, who implement his policies': Wyatt (1996: 36).

¹⁵⁵ In KTU 1.4 viii 26-9 Baal's messengers are instructed to pay homage to the god Mot; yet they do not honour him before delivering the message from Baal in KTU 1.5 ii. Otherwise, in KTU 1.2 i, the homage is paid by the messenger gods to the divine council and the supreme god. We shall discuss these texts further in Chapter III.

¹⁵⁶ M.S. Smith (1984: 359).

The Ugaritic conception of plural deities is found evidently in some Ugaritic terms. Hence, Ugaritic religious texts reflect the polytheistic and hierarchical beliefs of the Ugaritians. Thus, the Ugaritic terms, which denote the plurality of divine figures, lead to the realisation that the divine assembly is structured on several hierarchical levels, and that among the gods there exist lesser deities, placed at its lowest level, to serve the higher deities. The ranks among the deities depend on how close they are to the divine kingship and are also distinguished by nonverbal indications.

PART II: Membership of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Hebrew Bible

Biblical Hebrew references inform us that there are some forms of divine beings other than Yahweh who are recognised as his 'lesser deities'¹⁵⁷. Hence, some collective Hebrew nouns corroborate the plural conception of divine figures: בני אל(י)ם¹⁵⁸ (בני אלהים)¹⁵⁹ or קדשים¹⁶⁰, etc. These terms denote the 'lesser deities' in the divine assembly. In this part, the study will explain some collective Hebrew terms which include 'lesser deities' and their place within the hierarchical divine assembly. Some selected biblical Hebrew descriptions which reveal the hierarchical structure of the divine assembly will be investigated.

1. The Hebrew Titles of Lesser Deities

The research will survey some Hebrew terms necessary here to confirm the plurality of divine beings and their status as lesser deities in the divine assembly.

1.1. אלהים 'Gods'

Whilst Ugaritic lesser deities are identified as 'gods' (*ilm*)¹⁶¹, the same identification is seen possibly in the Hebrew Bible. The Hebrew noun אלהים

¹⁵⁷ The definition of 'lesser deity' in Part II will hereafter be the same definition applied previously to the Ugaritic studies in Part I. 'Lesser deities' represent the deities at the lowest level in the hierarchical pantheon.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Ps 29.1. We shall discuss these terms further in Chapter II.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Job 38.7. We shall discuss these terms further in Chapter II.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Pss 29.2; 96.9; 110.3; Prov 9.10 and 30.3. We shall discuss these terms further in Chapter II.

¹⁶¹ KTU 1.3 iii 32; 1.15 iii 19; 1.17 i 2-3, etc.

is employed sometimes to indicate celestial 'deities'¹⁶² or plural 'gods'¹⁶³. On the other hand, this Hebrew term is used also to indicate a single 'deity'¹⁶⁴. Thus, the term אלהים is regarded to imply not only a specific deity (Yahweh), but also any god(s) in general usage.

1.1.1. Genesis 3.5

The text reads:

כי ידע אלהים כי ביום אכלכם ממנו ונפקחו עיניכם
והייתם כאלהים ידעי טוב ורע

For God¹⁶⁵ knows that in the day you eat from it, then your eyes shall be opened, and you shall be gods¹⁶⁶, knowing good and evil.

¹⁶² Ps 138:1, etc.

¹⁶³ 1 Sam 4.8 describes האלהים האדירים, 'these mighty gods'; thus, it denotes 'Yahweh and his divine warrior(s)'. Cf. at Exod 32.1, אלהים is also read as a plural 'gods', followed by a plural verb ילכו.

¹⁶⁴ 1 Sam 28.13; it probably denotes a 'ghost' here. The dead can be discerned as "divine": Wyatt (1994b: 397). Cf. the מרחים, who receive sacrifices, at Ps 106.28.

¹⁶⁵ Although the etymology of the אלהים remains disputed, a grammatical investigation has been conducted. Traditionally it brings two meanings: 'God', as a singular; 'gods', as a plural. It is viewed as a plural form of the אלה; in this sense, it may bring a singular meaning as a synonym of the אל, 'God'; thus, it becomes an alternative name of Yahweh: HALOT 52-3; cf. 48-50 for אל. When it is interpreted as a plural meaning, it denotes 'gods': W.H. Schmidt (1997a: 115). Cf. Ug. *ilhm*, an unusual plural form of Ug. *il*: KTU 1.39.3, etc. (cf. Wyatt, 2002: 349 n. 8). It has been interpreted also as the 'abstract plural': Kautzsch (1910: §124; 1.c) or as the 'plural of intensity': Paul Joüon (1923: §136; d): 'plural of excellence', 'plural of majesty'; Eichrodt (1961: 184-86); Waltke-O'Connor (1990: 7.4.3a-f.): 'Honorifics and the Like'; Ringgren (1974: 272-3): the 'great, highest'; also, Rose (1992: 1006): 'God of gods' or 'the highest God'. Similarly, Jenks (1977: 8-9) suggests that it is a plural form which has been formed through the northern Israelite usage of the DN El; also Coote (1991: 75, 104). For further discussion on the term, see Burnett (2001; especially, 1-6).

¹⁶⁶ The כ at this place is taken as *kaph veritatis*: thus, Waltke-O'Connor (1990: 11.2.9b): "the logical outcome of comparison is correspondence or identity"; adopted by Wyatt (2001: 244 n. 4).

In this passage, the term אלהים may refer to plural 'gods' other than the supreme god. It occurs twice here; the first one indicates Yahweh, attested in a singular form of ידע; and the other refers to 'gods'¹⁶⁷ other than Yahweh¹⁶⁸; the plural forms of היה and ידע may support the fact that the אלהים is used more probably as a plural rather than as a singular (cf. v. 22)¹⁶⁹. It may be the remains, or the continuing reality, of the early Israelite tradition that had shared the Canaanite religious acknowledgement that the heavenly deities are identified as the same 'gods' with the supreme god¹⁷⁰.

These אלהים are conceded as having knowledge of good and evil. Hence, they are able to make a clear distinction between right and wrong, as is Yahweh (cf. Gen 3.22). In this regard, they are related to the omniscient messenger of God in other biblical references:

כי כמלאך האלהים כן אדני המלך לשמע הטוב והרע

For like the messenger of God, so is my lord the king to hear¹⁷¹
the good and the evil

(2 Sam 14.17b);

ואדני חכם כחכמת מלאך האלהים לדעת את כל אשר בארץ

But my lord is wise, like the wisdom of the messenger of God,
to know all¹⁷² that is in the earth

¹⁶⁷ Thus LXX reads θεοι, 'gods'. Cf. S.R. Driver (1909: 45); Skinner (1910: 75).

¹⁶⁸ Although Cassuto (1961: 146-7) prefers 'God' here, he does not deny a possibility that it can be translated also as 'divine beings', which agrees with the address in v. 22: 'one of us'.

¹⁶⁹ Sarna (1991: 25) also distinguishes the first term from the second term, which denotes 'divine beings', for grammatical reasons.

¹⁷⁰ W.F. Albright (1957: 213-4) addresses that the 'Israelites took over the Canaanite plural, *elôhîm* "gods," in the sense of "God" to express the 'totality of gods, i.e., as equivalent to the entire pantheon'. In any case, the אלהים is identified as 'gods'.

¹⁷¹ The שמע may be translated also either as 'to discern' (NASB; NRSV; NIV; ASV; KJV) or as 'to understand' (NJPS; NJB).

¹⁷² 'Knowing good and evil' constitutes a merism; sc. 'knowing everything': Wyatt (2001: 244 n. 5).

King David is recognised, in a woman's wish, as being equal to the messenger of God in having knowledge of good and evil; hence, since the messenger of God can acknowledge what is good, he also can execute right judgment (v. 17b). She reveals her connection with Joab to the king since he immediately discovered a plot (v. 20b)¹⁷³; the comparison is stressed again in a speech of Mephibosheth in order to appeal to the king's responsibility (2 Sam 19.28). The texts describe clearly how the messenger deities are omniscient. Thus, in relation to their knowledge, the אלהים at Gen 3.5 and 22 may be identified as the מלאך האלהים. It has been suggested that their privileged status of knowledge and discernment may be the result of their participation in the divine council (1 Kgs 22.19-22)¹⁷⁴. Yet, it seems more probable that their attribute is basically natural inasmuch as they are called אלהים, 'gods'.

In the meantime, Ugaritic lesser gods apparently seem to be restricted in their knowledge. Their discernment on some matters appears in the broken texts:

[<i>btlt ʿnt</i>	Virgin ¹⁷⁵ Anat
[<i>pp hkm</i> ¹⁷⁶	
[<i>h d l ydʿ bn il</i>	(something ¹⁷⁷) 'that Sons of El do not ¹⁷⁸ know'

¹⁷³ Cf. Hertzberg (1964: 333).

¹⁷⁴ Newsom (1992: 249).

¹⁷⁵ Ug. *btlt*, 'virgin': Gibson (1978: 57); DUL 250. Cf. Heb. בחולה: HALOT 166-7; Akk. *batultu*: AHw 115; CAD 2[B] 173-4. Differently, 'Maiden': van Zijl (1972: 83); 'Adolescent': M.S. Smith (1997: 123); 'Girl': Pardee (1997: 257).

¹⁷⁶ It has been translated doubtfully as 'powder', without suggesting any etymological connections: de Moor-Spronk (1987: 136); de Moor (1987: 110 and n. 2).

¹⁷⁷ KTU¹⁺² read the last letter of the lost term as *h*. De Moor-Spronk (1987: 46) restore the damaged letters conjecturally as the *rh*, 'scent' on the basis of KTU 1.3 ii 2: thus, de Moor

[<i>phr kkbm</i>	(that) the assembly of Stars [do not know],
[<i>dr dt šmm</i>	(that) the circle of those of the heavens [do not know]

(KTU 1.10 i 1-5).

Parker interprets that the “mention of Anat and Baal in the immediate [broken] context suggests that these two may share the knowledge denied to the *bn il*”¹⁷⁹. The *bn il*, paralleled with two other cola in the following lines, supports the idea that they are members of the divine council, identified as stars (cf. Job 38.7). These phrases, juxtaposed intentionally between Anat (line 1) and Baal (line 6) in the text, may be set in order to emphasise the higher deities’ comparatively distinguished abilities from these of the lesser deities. The context alludes to the cosmic secret, which is not opened yet to the lesser deities¹⁸⁰. Accordingly, the meaning of the text is turned negatively to the lesser gods.

Thus, the lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible are expressed as being omniscient and able to discern good and evil, as they are ‘gods’ themselves, whilst the Ugaritic lesser deities are restricted in their capacity of knowledge. These various descriptions evidently support the fact that the second אלהים in Gen 3.5 refers to ‘gods’ other than Yahweh.

(1987: 111 and n. 3). Unfortunately, it is hard to extract the precise meaning of the letters from the damaged texts.

¹⁷⁸ Ug. *l*; as a negative sense: Parker (1999c: 795). Wyatt (2002: 155 and n. 1) here suggests two possibilities of either ‘not’ or ‘indeed’, as an asseverative particle.

¹⁷⁹ Parker (1999c: 795).

¹⁸⁰ It is, however, difficult to reconstruct how the two higher deities have been related to the “cosmic secret” and functioned with other lesser gods from the text of KTU 1.10 i due to the damage of the tablet.

1.1.2. Psalm 8.6a [ET 5a]

The text reads:

ותחסרהו מעט מאלהים

Yet you have lowered¹⁸¹ him little than gods.

Ps 8.6a [ET 8.5a]¹⁸² also supports the view that the term אלהים(ה) refers to 'divine beings' by itself; sc. 'the members of the heavenly court of Yahweh'¹⁸³.

Heb. מאלהים can be read here as 'from gods'¹⁸⁴ rather than as 'from God'¹⁸⁵; hence it makes much clearer the meaning of the text, which takes God as the subject of the verb¹⁸⁶. LXX understands the last term of the phrase as ἀγγέλους¹⁸⁷. In this 'creation' psalm¹⁸⁸ it appears evident that the status of the lesser deities is higher than that of mortals, although glory and honour are given to them (8.6b)¹⁸⁹.

1.1.3. Psalm 82.1

The opening verse of Ps 82 implies the same setting:

אלהים נצב בעדת אל	God stands ¹⁹⁰ in the assembly of gods;
בקרב אלהים ישפט	in the midst of gods ¹⁹¹ he judges.

¹⁸¹ Heb. חסר denotes literally to 'lack, decrease': HALOT 338.

¹⁸² The verse-numbering of the Psalms is cited according to the Masoretic text in this study.

¹⁸³ Dahood (1966-70: [1] 51). Schedl's (1964) initial interpretation of the עוללים וינקים, 'babes and sucklings', in v. 3 as 'divine beings', rejected by Dahood (*ibid.*: 49-50), has been accepted and developed by Wyatt (1994b: 410-9) in a theogonic context.

¹⁸⁴ Parker (1999c: 797). Cf. von Rad (1962: 145) refers the אלהים to "angels".

¹⁸⁵ Weiser (1962: 144).

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Gibson (1998: 141).

¹⁸⁷ A.A. Anderson (1972: [1] 103). Thus, 'heavenly beings' (NIV); 'angels' (KJV). Cf. Heb 2.7, 9. G. Cooke (1964: 23) explains the אלהים at this place as evidence for the 'conception of a plurality of divine beings'.

¹⁸⁸ B.W. Anderson (1983: 237).

¹⁸⁹ והדר העטרהו, 'and (with) glory and honour you have crowned him'.

¹⁹⁰ The N. ptc. sg. form of the יצב, to 'erect' (cf. HALOT 714-5, נצב), indicates that the אלהים is used as a singular subject.

The majority of commentators refer to the first אלהים in v. 1a (also, in v. 8) as Yahweh¹⁹² to distinguish it from the second one in v. 1b (also, in v. 6), whose identity has been interpreted variously: such as Israelite judges¹⁹³; or kings of Judah/Israel¹⁹⁴; or rulers of other nations¹⁹⁵; or 'gods' other than Yahweh¹⁹⁶ (sc. the members of the divine council); or both gods and mortal judges¹⁹⁷.

But the phraseology seems to make explicit usage of the second אלהים as 'gods' since בקרב אלהים is paralleled with the previous phrase after the נצב¹⁹⁸. Whilst MT takes it as בעדת אל, 'in the divine meeting'¹⁹⁹, or, 'in the meeting of El'²⁰⁰, LXX reads it as ἐν συνάγωγῃ θεῶν, 'in the assembly of gods', which presupposes אלים/אלם, בעדת אלים, and which denotes a plural conception

¹⁹¹ The translation of LXX, which reads the אלהים in the second line of the verse as an accusative ('in the midst he judges gods'), is rejected by the fact that the בקרב is not found as the absolute form in the Hebrew Bible; see Salters (1991: 227). Thus, the בקרב is to be construed in a construct relation to the אלים.

¹⁹² Thus, Morgenstern (1939: 29 n. 1; citing some critics: Cheyne, Baethgen, Kent, Bertholet, Kittel, Gunkel and König); Gonzalez (1963: 293); Tsevat (1969: 126); A.A. Anderson (1972: [2] 593); Holladay (1993: 48); Parker (1995: 533 n. 4); and Wyatt (1996: 357, 359). It is explained cogently that the אלהים is used here rather than the Tetragrammaton since it is an "elohistic psalm": Tsevat (*ibid.*); Tate (1990: 329); followed by Wyatt (*ibid.*, 359). Weiser (1962: 556, 558) and Watson (1984: 293) prefer 'God'.

¹⁹³ Delitzsch (1888b: 459-62). Cf. LB: 'judges'.

¹⁹⁴ Wyatt (1996: 362).

¹⁹⁵ Duhm (1922: 317-8): the 'Hasmonean kings'; Bittenwieser (1938: 769-70): the 'deified kings of the Hellenistic age'. Cf. NASB: 'rulers'.

¹⁹⁶ Wellhausen (1898: 198); H. Schmidt (1934: 156-7); Gordon (1935: 143); Morgenstern (1939: 39); Rowley (1967: 251); Tsevat (1969: 125); A.A. Anderson (1972: [2] 593); Watson (1984: 293); Tate (1990: 329); ASV; KJV; NIV; NRSV; NJB; and NJPS: the 'divine beings'. Cf. G.E. Wright (1950: 31-2): the 'patron angels of the nations'; Kraus (1988-9: [2] 155-6).

¹⁹⁷ Niehr (1987).

¹⁹⁸ M.S. Smith (2002: 144).

¹⁹⁹ Or, 'assembly'.

²⁰⁰ Seybold (1990: 136). Morgenstern (1939: 39 n. 22) refers to the אל as the 'North-Semitic' deity El, but translates as the 'divine assembly'. Also, see Wyatt (1996: 357, 359).

of 'gods'²⁰¹. Although major translations, following MT, take a singular god for the denotation of the second term of the phrase²⁰², the *Vorlage* of the text of LXX, concerning plural 'gods', seems more likely to reflect the 'original text'²⁰³ for its Ugaritic reference is attested at KTU 1.15 ii 7: 'dt ilm the 'meeting/assembly of gods'²⁰⁴. In any case the supposed phrase indicates the plural conception of the deities and it is paralleled semantically with אלהים בקרב.

Moreover, it may be said that עדה אל/אלם reflects a 'North Semitic origin'; according to Morgenstern, the phrase is related to the 'North Semitic' (Ugaritic) expression of El's council, in which his auxiliaries/helpers or sons are its members²⁰⁵. Hence there is no reason to reject the interpretation of the second אלהים as 'gods'. Consequently עדה אל/אלם, the 'divine assembly'; the 'assembly of El'; or the 'assembly of gods' (v. 1), אלהים, 'gods' (vv. 1b, 6),

²⁰¹ It is supported by the Vulgate and the Syro-Hexaplar, whilst various other readings (Symmachus and Jerome) render it to the singular אל. Morgenstern (1939: 29 n. 1) cites Duhm and Bittenwieser, who read the text as 'אלים'. Also, cf. Salters (1991: 226): 'אליים בעדה'.

²⁰² ASV; KJV. Or as an adjective, 'divine': NAB; NJB; NJPS; and RSV.

²⁰³ Thus, Salters (1991: 226): "If two Hebrew versions did exist, the plural is likely to have been the original, for it is difficult to see why a plural ending might have been added: much easier to recognise the reasons for deliberately dropping such an ending; for it left plural there is the greater possibility of the phrase being interpreted as an assembly of gods"; also, Parker (1999a: 206).

²⁰⁴ At this point, it alludes possibly to the existence of gods other than Yahweh as its polytheistic background. It may have been transformed into "monotheistic" circumstances. Cf. Salters (1991: 226-7).

²⁰⁵ Morgenstern (1939: 39 n. 22). Morgenstern (*ibid.*: 29-126) also supposes that the text of Ps 82 is originated from Ugaritic poetry except for vv. 2-4, which are regarded as secondary and added to the original text. Yet these verses are viewed as the parallel to KTU 1.16 i 14 ff. by O'Callaghan (1954: 313); thus, he says that they belong to the original part of the hymn.

and בני עליון, 'sons of Elyon' (v. 6) are all regarded as members of the divine council²⁰⁶.

According to most scholars, it is not in question that Yahweh presides over this divine council²⁰⁷. By contrast, some say that Yahweh is one of the gods subordinate to the presiding El (or Elyon) in the council of El²⁰⁸; thus, Schmidt argues that El is the presiding god and Yahweh is the judge in the divine council²⁰⁹.

On the other hand, whilst others conclude that Yahweh is the judge²¹⁰, there are some dissenters. Parker has argued that the "שפט neither states nor implies that the speaker is presiding over the gods, only that he is accusing the gods" inasmuch as the meaning of the term is varied in the contexts of the psalm. He has also insisted that the term נצב in v. 1a indicates Yahweh's subordinate position to El for the members of the divine assembly are supposed to stand 'as distant from the presiding deity' (the יצב in Job 1.6, 2.1; and עמד in 1 Kgs 22.19, 21, whilst Yahweh is יושב 'sitting'²¹¹, etc.)²¹².

²⁰⁶ Parker (1995: 533).

²⁰⁷ Kraus (1988-9: [2] 154-6); Gonzalez (1963: 301); Loretz (1975: 588); Gordon (1978: 129-31); Mullen (1980: 230, 232); and M.S. Smith (2002: 37, 144).

²⁰⁸ Schmid (1955: 183-7); Eissfeldt (1956: 25-37); Schlisske (1973: 33-4); Niehr (1990: 80, 81); and von Rad (1962: 211, 223).

²⁰⁹ W.H. Schmidt (1966: 33). In contrast to this view, see Weiser (1962: 558 n. 1).

²¹⁰ Ackerman (1966: 306); Preuss (1971: 112); Niehr (1986: 98, 373, 379-80); Watson (1984: 292); and Miller (1986: 121).

²¹¹ The ptc. masc. sg. form of יָשַׁב.

²¹² Parker (1995: 536-7) cites Boecker (1964: 85-6): Exod 18.13-4; Judg 4.5; Joel 4.12; Ps 122.5; Prov 20.8; and Dan 7.9-10. However, cf. Ezek 44.24: יַעֲמְדוּ לִשְׁפֹּט, 'and they shall take their stand to judge'; citing others (G.A. Cooke, 1936: 486: 'officiate', 'preside'; Zimmerli, 1979-83: [2] 450; NJPS and NRSV: 'act as judges'), Parker tends to interpret it as rhetorical; hence, in an executive sense; yet, this is not convincing; a literal translation of the first term is more acceptable in this verse. It is no problem to accept Yahweh's standing posture as the judge's attitude. Cf. Isa 3.13-14a: נִצָּב לְרִיב יְהוָה וְעָמַד לְדִין עַמִּים יְהוָה בְּמִשְׁפָּט יִבּוֹא, 'Yahweh stands to strive; and he takes his stand to judge the peoples; Yahweh comes into judgement'.

Hence Yahweh is standing in the assembly (which is unusual in the general cases of judges, who sit when they judge²¹³) and thus it can be said that Yahweh is not presiding over the divine council; he is originally a subordinate deity in El's assembly²¹⁴.

However, this is denied by Wyatt for two reasons: 1) Yahweh is a 'southern Palestinian form of El'²¹⁵; and 2) 'the plea that Yahweh should arise (קוּמָה אֱלֹהִים, v. 8) implies that he is not already standing'; hence Yahweh's sitting position is a prerequisite for the usage of קוּמָה; thus, he understands נָצַב in v. 1a to indicate Yahweh's presiding action²¹⁶. Therefore, נָצַב may be used to denote his gesture to preside over the divine council, whilst the term קוּמָה is used to exhort Yahweh to stand up to judge at this place²¹⁷. Yahweh's

Yahweh takes the role of the 'accusing' judge here. It can be understood in the same sense. Contrast to this, Parker (1995: 537 and n. 17): Yahweh as a plaintiff.

²¹³ Parker (1995: 536-7) cites Boecker (1964: 85-6): Exod 18.13-4; Judg 4.5; Joel 4.12; Ps 122.5; Prov 20.8; and Dan 7.9-10. However, cf. Ezek 44.24: יַעֲמְדוּ לִשְׁפֹּט, 'and they shall take their stand to judge'; citing others (G.A. Cooke, 1936: 486: 'officiate', 'preside'; Zimmerli, 1979-83: [2] 450; NJPS and NRSV: 'act as judges'), Parker tends to interpret it as rhetorical; hence, in an executive sense. Yet, this is not convincing. A literal translation of the first term is more acceptable in this verse. It is no problem to accept Yahweh's standing posture as the judge's attitude. Cf. Isa 3.13-14a: נָצַב לְרִיב יְהוָה וְעָמַד לְדִין עַמִּים יְהוָה בְּמִשְׁפַּט יָבוֹא, 'Yahweh stands to strive; and he takes his stand to judge the peoples; Yahweh comes into judgement'. Yahweh takes the role of the 'accusing' judge here. It can be understood in the same sense. Contrast to this, Parker (1995: 537 and n. 17): Yahweh as a plaintiff.

²¹⁴ Parker (1995: 535-8).

²¹⁵ Cf. Cross (1973: 44): "El is clearly regarded as a proper name of Yahweh".

²¹⁶ Wyatt (1996: 357-8 n. 2). M.S. Smith (2002: 37) also holds the view that Yahweh is here "enthroned amidst the assembly of divine beings".

²¹⁷ Watson (1984: 302, 303) correlates God with the sun motif which is suggested by some related terms such as 'arise' and 'darkness', etc. Yet שָׁמוֹשׁ never happens with קוּמָה. Rather, it occurs with יָצָא (Gen 19.23, etc.) or זָרַח (Gen 32.31, etc.) to denote the rising sun. Hence, קוּמָה is more properly construed here in regard to the expected movement of Yahweh from his throne.

presiding in the divine council also corresponds to the Ugaritic god El's presiding over a similar council of divine beings (KTU 1.2 i 19 ff.)²¹⁸.

In the meantime, although בקרב may be translated generally as 'inside' or 'among'²¹⁹, it is more probable that it should be translated literally in v. 1b to suggest that Yahweh is positioned 'in the middle of' the gods, supposing that he appears as the supreme god among them by taking the central place²²⁰.

Additionally, the narration in v. 5 inserted between two addresses (vv. 2-4 and vv. 6-7) interrupts them and justifies the fact that the wandering 'divine beings'²²¹ deserve to be impeached by the celestial court²²²:

לא ידעו	They do not know;
ולא יבינו	and they do not understand.
בחשכה יתהלכו	In darkness they walk back and forth ²²³ ;
ימוטו כל מוסדי ארץ	all foundations of the earth are quaking.

It informs us that the accused deities are running about in confusion²²⁴. The result of the administration of the gods on earth may affect the order of the whole world²²⁵; the earth, in fact, is founded upon justice (Isa 28.16).

²¹⁸ Cross (1973: 186-90) points out that the Council of Yahweh is the 'Israelite counterpart of the council of El'.

²¹⁹ Parker (1995: 536 n. 15).

²²⁰ Mullen (1980: 231). In this respect, the expression יהוה אלהים may be rendered to 'Yahweh of gods' or 'Lord of gods', construed as the supreme god among the gods so that the אלהים may be taken as a plural form (Gen 2.16, etc.): Wyatt (1996: 366 n. 15; 2001: 244 n. 1).

²²¹ The issue of the identity of these entities shall be dealt with in Chapter II.

²²² Tsevat (1969: 129): v. 5 is 'not an address or a proclamation but the deliberation of the judge in camera in preparation of the verdict'; followed by Wyatt (1996: 362). The judge here means Yahweh.

²²³ The hithpael form of the הִלֵךְ, 'go, come, walk' (HALOT 246-8), has an iterative meaning at this place: Lambdin (1971: 250).

At any rate, the psalm may allow an interpretation in terms of an Ugaritic polytheistic²²⁶ setting. The hierarchy of angelic power in the text may show a transitional step of Israelite religion en route for “monotheism” or absolute Yahwism from the polytheistic background²²⁷.

1.1.4. Psalm 97.7b

The text reads:

השתחוּ לו כל אלהים Prostrate²²⁸ yourselves to him, all gods!

The term אלהים appears again here in a context of adoration of Yahweh. The term evidently denotes plural beings for it takes a plural verb (השתחוּ)²²⁹. It may indicate the false ‘gods’ who have been judged as a פסל, ‘idol’²³⁰, or as

²²⁴ In the Ugaritic paralleled descriptions, lesser deities are described as wandering to and fro when they fall into panic; after the death of Baal, lesser deities travelled here and there; and they arrived at the divine assembly of El to report the Baal’s death: *šbn[y l q]št [a]r[š xx]h ‘d[[k]] ksm mhyt*, ‘[We] have turned around [to the e]nds of the [ea]r[th], (to) the edge of the meadow’ (KTU 1.5 vi 3-5).

²²⁵ Tsevat (1969: 128 and n. 15).

²²⁶ Cf. the comment of Rowley (1967: 251) on v. 1 of the psalm: Yahweh is “one of many gods and it is undoubted that behind the religion of Israel lies polytheism”.

²²⁷ Morgenstern (1939: 114); and Wyatt (1996: 22): “The world envisaged by Ps 82, where it appears that polytheism is in the process of being rejected in favour of monotheism, gives no indication of modification of either the structure of cosmology, or the mythological level”. Thus, Rofé (1969: xxiii) concludes that the early polytheistic view is evidently found in the mythological elements in the Hebrew Bible and that the lesser deities in the pantheon had been “deposed to the status of an angel”, leaving Yahweh alone as the absolute god, in a process of monotheisation.

²²⁸ Whilst the השתחוּ is taken, as a possibility, in the indicative (NAB, NJPS, and NRSV), it is taken, more probably, as the hithpael, impv. form (ASV, KJV, NASB, NIV, and NJB) of the שחח, to ‘bow down, prostrate oneself’: BDB 1005; HALOT 1457 (cf. 1458 [שחח]). Freedman’s oral suggestion as a precative (hence: ‘May all the heavenly beings bow down to him’) is rejected by Howard (1997: 70-1): a precative sense does not occur in suffixing forms, but only with prefixing conjugations (Kautzsch, 1910: §109; b).

²²⁹ Holladay (1993: 125).

²³⁰ BDB 820; HALOT 949. The ‘graven image of an idol’: GHCLOTS 684.

אליל, 'insufficiency, worthlessness'²³¹, in v. 7a²³²; thus, it has been regarded as an "ironical challenge" to the false gods²³³.

However, LXX interprets it as 'messengers': πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, 'All his messengers'²³⁴, which may presuppose כל אלהיו. Thus the phrase may be best understood as the interpretation that the psalmist urges lesser deities to adore the divine sovereignty of the true god Yahweh, after judging the worshippers of idols; hence it may be intended to connote the rank of other אלהים (ἄγγελοι) subordinate to the absolute אלהים. In any case, the אלהים here evidently denotes the plural 'gods' other than the supreme 'god' Yahweh.

The imperative form of the verb שחא denotes the rank of the אלהים before Yahweh; they are called to worship their cosmic king²³⁵. Thus the אלהים may designate the divine assembly or council who are to celebrate Yahweh's enthronement²³⁶.

1.1.5. Psalm 138.1b

The doxological text reads:

נגד אלהים אזמרח

Before gods I praise you.

²³¹ HALOT 55-6.

²³² יבשו כל עבדי פסל המתהללים באלילים, 'All who are serving (graven) image(s) be ashamed; those who are praising worthless idols'.

²³³ Scroggie (1978: 286).

²³⁴ Cf. 'divine beings' (NJPS); other translations take it as 'gods': NASB; RSV; NJB; NIV; and KJV. Holladay (1993: 85) remarks that "where the Septuagint does seem to be interpretive, it is because it is a theological product of its time"; but, LXX takes θεοί for אלהים at Ps 82.6. Thus it is clear that the אלהים conveys basically the meaning of 'gods', but with a theological interpretation it may be translated as divine agents (cf. Heb 1:6).

²³⁵ Thus, it is classified as a royal psalm by Gunkel (1928: 90).

²³⁶ Seeligmann (1964: 83).

In the setting of an exaltation of Yahweh, it is more understandable to see the אלהים as lesser 'gods' of Yahweh rather than as other existent pagan 'gods'²³⁷ since it is unconvincing that the psalmist is praising Yahweh in front of pagan 'gods'²³⁸. Hence it is notable that LXX reads the text: ἐναντίον ἀγγέλων ψαλῶ σοι, 'before messengers I will sing praise to you'²³⁹. Thus it may support the fact that the lesser deities of Yahweh can be identified as 'gods'.

1.2. אלים/אלים 'Gods'

Divine beings of the heavens are called also the אלים, 'gods', (cf. Exod 15.11; Dan 11.36) constituting the celestial court of Yahweh; in the mythological description of Ps 58.2 the judgement of the gods is present as one of the main tasks in the divine assembly²⁴⁰, which may be related most closely to Ps 82. The divine conflict between the supreme god and lesser deities happens as follows:

האמנם אלים צדק תדברון	Do you indeed, O gods, speak ²⁴¹ righteousness?
מישרים תשפטו בני אדם	Do you judge (with) equity ²⁴² the sons of Adam ²⁴³ ?

²³⁷ Dahood (1966-70: [3] 276-7). Differently, as 'princes' or 'judges': Murphy (1875: 663).

²³⁸ Thus it can be suggested that the doxology is given to Yahweh, who is in the 'divine court of the gods in heaven': Weiser (1962: 798); Brueggemann (1984: 131).

²³⁹ Cf. 'divine beings' (NJPS); 'angels' (NJB); other translations make it 'gods' (NASB; RSV; NIV; and KJV).

²⁴⁰ The psalm contains a mythological view of history, which is seen to be controlled by the gods: Zenger (1996: 37). It reveals also an ancient idea of the hierarchical divine realm: sc. the supreme god Yahweh and his lesser gods in charged.

²⁴¹ The plural form of the דבר, to 'speak' (HALOT 210-1), indicates the plurality of the gods.

²⁴² Lit. 'equities'.

²⁴³ Wyatt (2001: 244 n. 1) interestingly suggests that the אדם is used ideologically to indicate the 'Primal Man', who has had the primal kingship.



In the trial the speaker seems to be Yahweh. Divine beings are called 'gods' and asked, with a rebuke, about their duty as judges²⁴⁴; and they are given a verdict (v. 3 [ET v. 2]).

For the reason of the mythological description of the gods, Weiser cogently explains that 'it is a matter of the process, which finds its explanation in the history of religion, whereby the Yahweh religion absorbed and reduced to a lower rank the gods associated with the worship at the Canaanite shrines; in the course of this process, the Old Testament monotheistic idea of God made use of the foreign polytheistic religious elements to suit its own purposes and brought its own moral superiority to bear on them'²⁴⁵.

1.3. בני אלהים (ה) 'Sons of God'

These titles of lesser deities contain a mythological sense. The 'Sons of God' seem to fit on the same level as the מלאכים, 'messenger deities', in the divine hierarchy. The titles probably convey the 'kinship' relation of lesser deities to their master god²⁴⁶.

1.4. מועד 'Assembly'²⁴⁷

The term is associated with הר, conveying the conception of the assembly: hence, הר מועד, 'mount of assembly' (Isa 14.13); in the passage, it is related to the כוכבי אל, 'Stars of El'. It may reflect the same idea represented in the

²⁴⁴ According to Watson (1984: 286), the צדק and the משפט constitute here the 'envelope figure', which means the "repetition of the same phrase or sentence at the beginning and end of a stanza or poem" (*ibid.*: 282-3). As 'keywords', they may highlight here the function of the gods, who are charged with judging on the basis of righteousness.

²⁴⁵ Weiser (1962: 430).

²⁴⁶ We will discuss these terms further in Chapter II.

²⁴⁷ Or, 'meeting': HALOT 557-8. Cf. Ug. *m^cd*: UT §19.1512; WUS no. 1195; DUL 520.

Ugaritic texts (cf. Ug. *phr m^cd²⁴⁸*). Thus it implies that the Hebrew writers believed in the existence of deities other than Yahweh²⁴⁹.

1.5. כוכבים (ה) 'Stars'

The term occurs in parallel with the צבא השמים (Deut 4.19; Job 38.7; Ps 148.3; Isa 14.13; Jer 8.2; cf. Dan 8.10), which may indicate warrior deities. As an astronomical expression it may portray a countless number of celestial beings²⁵⁰.

1.6. סוד אלוה (סוד יהוה)²⁵¹ 'Council²⁵³ of God (Yahweh)'²⁵⁴

They are used diversely to denote 'multitudes of divine beings'²⁵⁵. It emphasises the fact that Yahweh (or El) presides over the council.

²⁴⁸ Cross (1953: 274 n. 1); Gray (1964a: 59).

²⁴⁹ The reason for the biblical usage of the similar Semitic terms has been explained properly by Cross (1953: 274 n. 1): "while some of the imagery and poetic language featuring biblical allusions to the council of Yahweh find their ultimate origin in the assembly of the gods common to the mythological *Weltbild* of Mesopotamia and Canaan, the conception of the heavenly assembly was radically transformed on being incorporated into the faith of Israel".

²⁵⁰ The term shall be studied again in Chapter IV.

²⁵¹ Cf. Job 15.8.

²⁵² Cf. Jer 23.18. Also cf. סודי, 'my council', at v. 22.

²⁵³ The סוד, 'circle of confidants, council': HALOT 745. Suggested etymological connections of the סוד are various: related to the supposed $\sqrt{\text{סוד}}$, to 'sit', taking a sense of 'sitting for conversation or consultation': Fuerst (1867: 970); or to $\sqrt{\text{סד}}$, to 'sit together' (cf. Niphal): BDB 691; GHLOTS 580. For further etymological argumentation, see Fabry (1999: 171-2). Parker (1999a: 204-5) argues that the usage of the סוד for the divine 'council' had originated with the Israelites. However, the *sd* for the divine 'council', which is most possibly related to the Hebrew term, is found once at KTU 1.20 i 4, whilst the *qhl* does not occur in the Ugaritic texts.

²⁵⁴ For the concept of the divine council, cf. Isa 35.3-4; 40.1-8, 26; 44.26; 48.20-22; 52.7-10; 57.14 and 62.10-2. For the study of the council of Yahweh, see representatively Robinson (1944); Cross (1953); and Mullen (1980: 113-144).

1.7. עדה אל 'Divine Assembly'²⁵⁶ or 'Assembly of El'²⁵⁷

The expression occurs as a designation for the assembly of the supreme god; it may be related to the imagery of the divine assembly in the Ugaritic texts: Ug. *ʿdt ilm* (cf. KTU 1.15 ii 7)²⁵⁸.

1.8. קהל קדשים (סוד קדשים)²⁵⁹ 'Assembly'²⁶⁰ (Council) of Holy Ones'

The קהל occurs with an association of קדשים²⁶¹ in the Hebrew Bible²⁶². They may refer to a group of lesser deities.

1.9. Miscellaneous Hebrew Titles

There are some other titles of lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible: בני עליון, 'Sons of Elyon' (Ps 82.6); צבא (וה), 'Host' (cf. Ps 89.9); and קדשים, 'Holy Ones' (cf. Job 5.1; 15.15, etc.), etc. They will be examined in later chapters.

Summary

As shown in the previous treatment of the Ugaritic corpus, some Ugaritic collective terms (*ilm*, *dr il*, *phr ilm*, *ʿdt ilm*, *phr mʿd*, etc.) denote the plurality

²⁵⁵ For other cases, cf. the כוכבי אל, the 'stars of God (or El)': Isa 14.13; the כוכבי בקר, 'morning stars': Job 38.7; the רפאים, the 'Rephaim': Isa 14.9; and the בניי (restored after LXX), 'his sons': Prov 30.4.

²⁵⁶ The עדה; the f. form of the עדה: HALOT 789-90 (also see מועד: HALOT 557-8). Cf. Ug. *ʿdt*: UT §19.1816; WUS no. 1195; DUL 151-2.

²⁵⁷ Cf. Ps 82.1. Morgenstern (1939: 39 n. 22) refers to the origin of the אל as the 'North Semitic' god El; Yahweh is recognized often as El: יהוה אל, 'Yahweh is El' (Ps 118.27). For the same translation, also cf. Wyatt (1996: 357).

²⁵⁸ G.R. Driver (1956: 37 n. 5).

²⁵⁹ Ps 89.8. Also cf. Gen 49.6.

²⁶⁰ קהל is not attested in other Northwest Semitics, such as Ugaritic, Phoenician, or older Aramaic. For its basic meaning of 'assembly, convocation, congregation, assembled multitude', see BDB 874; HALOT 1079-80; Müller (1997: 1118). Cf. Ug. (*m*)*phr(t)* and *dr*, 'circle'.

²⁶¹ The קדשים as an indication of plural deities shall be discussed in Chapter II.

²⁶² Ps 89.6.

of the lesser deities and their membership in the divine assembly. Similarly, some Hebrew terms of divine titles (אלהים, אלים/אלם, and מועד, etc.) attest the plurality of divine beings and their membership of the divine assembly in the biblical Hebrew texts. Whilst Ugaritic lesser gods are discerned as being restricted in knowledge (KTU 1.10 i 1-5), Hebrew lesser gods (אלהים) are described as omniscient (Gen 3.22; 2 Sam 14.17b, 20b). Psalm 8.6a describes that they are figures superior to humans. Biblical Hebrew references state that they are members of the heavenly council (Ps 82.1) and their hierarchical status is classified as lesser deities (Ps 97.7b; 138.1b). Yahweh's lesser deities are called also אלים or אלם (Exod 15.11; Ps 58.2 [ET 58:1]; Dan 11.36). Like the Ugaritic expression *bn ilm*, the Hebrew terms בני אלהים (ה) are used to denote, with a mythological sense, the 'lesser deities' (cf. Chapter II). Other Hebrew terms are suggested evidently as the mythological terms to indicate 'lesser deities': מועד (Isa 14.13); כוכבים (ה); סוד אלוה [סוד יהוה] אל (Ps 82.1); קדשים (סוד קדשים) קהל קדשים; בני עליון; צבא (ות); and קדשים, etc.

2. Position of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Hebrew Bible

In order to examine the position of lesser deities in the divine assembly in the Hebrew Bible, it would be necessary to see how the hierarchical divine assembly is structured and how the rank of the lesser deities is suggested in the divine assembly.

2.1. Hierarchical Structure of the Divine Assembly in the Hebrew Bible

The research will now be concerned with the hierarchical structure of the divine assembly in the Hebrew Bible. Through the relation of the celestial beings with the divine king Yahweh, we may find the hierarchical structure of the divine assembly.

2.1.1. Genesis 1.26a

The text implies the existence of deities other than Yahweh:

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדִמוּתֵנוּ

And God said, 'Let us make a man in our image after our likeness'.

The 1. pl. form of the נַעֲשֶׂה here has been traditionally interpreted by Christians as an expression of the Trinity²⁶³. Yet this is a dogmatic judgment²⁶⁴. It has also been regarded as the 'plural of majesty' like the אֱלֹהִים , 'God'²⁶⁵, or as the 'plural of exhortation': e.g. 'Let's go'²⁶⁶. Yet these arguments do not explain the 1. pl. suffixes of the following phrases, $\text{בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדִמוּתֵנוּ}$, and the other biblical reference of the 1. pl. expression 'us' (Gen 3.22).

Instead, it is interpreted here as an indication of the heavenly assembly, in which the supreme god is surrounded by other celestial beings (cf. Gen 3.22; 11.7; Ps 29.1-2; 82; 89.6-7; Job 1.6; 2.1; 38.7; Isa 6.8; 1 Kgs 22.19-22; Dan 4.14; and 7.10)²⁶⁷. The presence of divine beings other than Yahweh leads to the theological objection that if they are lesser deities, their participation in the creation of humans is problematic since they are creatures as well (Ps 8.6). However, it may be relieved by Delitzsch's explanation that it does not indicate their co-operation, but their sympathy (or approval in the divine council)²⁶⁸. Thus the נַעֲשֶׂה is best construed as the 'cohortative of consultation' with other gods²⁶⁹. This polytheistic vision

²⁶³ Especially, the Church Fathers; Calvin; followed by Delitzsch (1888a: 98); Armstrong (1962: 39, 69-70, and 132 n. 1).

²⁶⁴ S.R. Driver (1909: 14); Skinner (1910: 30-1).

²⁶⁵ S.R. Driver (1909: 14). For various grammatical interpretations of the אֱלֹהִים , see n. 165 above.

²⁶⁶ Cassuto (1961: 55-6).

²⁶⁷ The Jewish tradition (Bereshith Rabba, viii 3-7) follows this view. Cf. Skinner (1910: 30-1); von Rad (1972: 58); Sarna (1989: 12) and Kline (2000: 28).

²⁶⁸ Delitzsch (1888a: 98-9).

²⁶⁹ S.R. Driver (1909: 14-5); Skinner (1910: 30).

supports the fact that Yahweh is presiding over the divine council as the supreme god and the other celestial beings are participating in the convention as his lesser deities²⁷⁰.

Consequently the divine image is given a human form. The repeated phrases with a similar meaning, בצלמנו כדמותנו, emphasise the human resemblance to gods and their godlike quality, which may be related to his sovereignty over the earth (Gen 1.26b)²⁷¹. It is interpreted also as a corporeal implication 'in accordance with the anthropomorphic conception of the godhead among the peoples of the ancient East'²⁷². Nevertheless, the mortal is ranked as being less than celestial gods (Ps 8.6a [ET 8.5a]).

2.1.2. Genesis 3.22

The text uses the same 'us', referring clearly to Yahweh and other deities:

ויאמר יהוה אלהים הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו לדעת טוב ורע

ועתה פן ישלח ידו ולקח גם מעץ החיים ואכל וחי לעלם

And Yahweh of the gods²⁷³ said, 'Behold, the man has become one²⁷⁴ of us to know good and evil'; and now, he may stretch out his hand, and take also from the tree of the lives, and eat, and live for ever.

אחר and the following 1. pl. form with a preposition (ממנו) imply the existence of divine beings other than Yahweh; it suggests that lesser deities are mentioned among 'us'²⁷⁵. As is the case at Gen 1.26a, this is not an intra-

²⁷⁰ Hebel (1985: 538). Sarna (1989: 12) argues that "This is the Israelite version of the Polytheistic assemblies of the pantheon—monotheized and depaganized".

²⁷¹ Sarna (1989: 12).

²⁷² Cassuto (1961: 56). This view, explained and also rejected by Cassuto, is acceptable here. He construes that the meaning has been 'corporeal' at the first step, and then it has been changed to 'spiritual'. Yet it seems to connote both.

²⁷³ See n. 220 above.

²⁷⁴ The *kaph veritatis*.

²⁷⁵ S.R. Driver (1909: 50); G. Cooke (1964: 23).

trinitarian dialogue. The text signifies Yahweh as the figure presiding over the divine council; his initial address provides an agenda for discussion with other divine beings. In this regard, the second element of the **אלהים יהוה** can be referred to as the divine attendants of the heavenly council²⁷⁶; they are summoned to Yahweh's court for his judgments (cf. Ps 82.1). It is described in the same manner also in Gen 11.7 (**נרדה**, 'let us go down')²⁷⁷ and Isa 6.8 (**לנו ומי ילך**, 'and who will go for us?'). All texts allude to the context of the council of Yahweh and other divine beings that surround him²⁷⁸, entailing the hierarchical structure of the divine assembly.

As discussed above, the ability to discern good and evil is one of the privileges of the gods²⁷⁹. Adam has obtained one of the divine characteristics: knowledge; it is cause for concern that now he is trying to acquire another one: immortality. In doing so, the fruit of the tree of life may bring him the completion of his divinity²⁸⁰.

Summary

The hierarchical structure of the divine assembly in the Hebrew Bible mainly comprises two hierarchical ranks: the supreme god Yahweh and his lesser deities. Compared with the Ugaritic system of the pantheon, it is simplified in the Hebrew Bible. Biblical Hebrew references attest to the existence of lesser deities and their plurality (Gen 1.26a; 3.22, etc.). For instance, the **אלהים** can be construed as either a single god (Yahweh) or plural gods (lesser

²⁷⁶ Whilst this may be intended as the 'monotheistic' translation by the writer and by the tradition, it is acceptable that the **אלהים** was understood originally in a plural sense, which implies a polytheistic concept: Wyatt (1996: 366 n. 15; 2001: 244 n. 1).

²⁷⁷ A majority of interpreters (Cross, 1953: 275 n. 4; Schmid, 1955: 172; and G. Cooke, 1964: 22-3, *et al.*) find a polytheistic conception from this place.

²⁷⁸ Parker (1999c: 797).

²⁷⁹ Cf. Cassuto (1961: 172).

²⁸⁰ Wyatt (1996: 363). Wyatt (*ibid.*) interestingly remarks that the "trees were one and the same, for only one tree could stand 'in the middle of the garden' (Gen 2.9)".

deities) as members of the heavenly council. The lesser deities participate as members in Yahweh's assembly, whose government is over the cosmos.

2.2. Rank of Lesser Deities in the Divine Assembly in the Hebrew Bible

This study will consider the rank of lesser deities in the divine council of Yahweh by examining some biblical Hebrew texts which contain the manifest evidence of the existence of lesser deities.

2.2.1. Deuteronomy 33.2-3

Lesser deities around Yahweh may be found in the text²⁸¹:

יהוה מסיני בא	Yahweh from Sinai came,
וזרח משעיר למו	and ²⁸² he lit forth ²⁸³ from Seir to them ²⁸⁴ ,
הופיע מהר פארן	he shone forth ²⁸⁵ from Mount Paran ²⁸⁶ ,

²⁸¹ The 'Blessing of Moses' is one of the most difficult texts in Hebrew Bible studies. The study on the date of the text has been conducted diligently so far: Phythian-Adams (1923); Gaster (1947b); Cross-Freedman (1948); Kittle (1959); Seeligman (1964); Jeremias (1965: 62-4, 127-8, 140); Margulis (1969); Cassuto (1973b); and Freedman (1980).

²⁸² It is read that the waw-consecutive of the וזרח and the ואתה was added later to the original text (Budde, 1922; Cross-Freedman, 1948: 198 n. 4), although Cassuto (1973b: 50) doubts its later addition to the text.

²⁸³ The זרח, to 'rise, come forth, shine' (BDB 280; HALOT 281), is used generally to denote the appearance of stars (Num 24.17) and planets (Gen 32.32). Cf. Is 58.10; Ps 112.4.

²⁸⁴ Whilst MT reads the letters following after the משעיר as למו, LXX interprets them as εἰς ὑμᾶς, 'to us', which presupposes לנו or לעמו (also, cf. Targum); thus, Cassuto (1973b: 50) and Cross (1973: 101) read לנו for its orthographic emendation. But it is more preferably read as למו, 'to them'; thus: Freedman (1980: 32); followed by D.L. Christensen (1984: 386; 2002: 832). Cf. Seeligmann (1964: 76, 77) takes it as לעמו, 'to his people', which is to be paralleled with the רבבה and the עם in v. 5b: cf. de Moor (1997: 256 n. 228). It can also be read as 'to him'.

²⁸⁵ The יפע; to 'shine forth': BDB 422; HALOT 424; Schnutenhaus (1964); Jeremias (1965: 62-4). It may be related to the usage of its Ugaritic cognate in the context of the divine conflict of KTU 1.2 i 3; 1.3 iii 37-8 and iv 4: Miller (1973: 77). Ug. yp^c denotes the luminous theophany of Yam. Thus with this sense it is here used properly to express the theophany of Yahweh: Mayes (1979: 398).

ואתה מרבבת קדש and he came²⁸⁷ from ten thousands of the
Holy Ones²⁸⁸;

מימינו אש דת למו from his right hand marched the gods,
אף חבב עמים indeed, (the ones) who love²⁸⁹ peoples²⁹⁰;

כל קדשיו בידך all his Holy Ones²⁹¹ are under his hand²⁹²,

²⁸⁶ The פארן appears as the מדבר, 'wilderness' (Num 10.12), which may indicate also the דר: Simons (1959: 23). Thus, cf. Hab 3.3.

²⁸⁷ The אתה, to 'come' (DCH, 454), is structured to be paralleled with the בא as synonyms: Freedman (1980: 38-9).

²⁸⁸ Cross-Freedman (1948: 199 n. 9) correct, more probably, קדשם to קדש (supported through Targum Onkelos [קדישין]), suggesting that the original ending ם had been dropped off for haplography; and they translate it in a collective sense: cf. Nyberg (1938: 335-6); Milik (1957: 253 n. 2) and Cross (1966: 26 n. 49). In the Hebrew Bible the קדש(ים) denotes the 'gods': cf. the reading of LXX on Exod 15.11; thus, Miller (1973: 184 n. 23). Differently, קדש מערבות, 'from the desert of Qadesh': Seeligmann (1964: 76, 77); מערבת קדש, 'from the steppes of Kadesh': Cassuto (1973b: 50), citing Böttcher, Bertholet and Budde; or מרבבת קדש, 'from the ten thousands of Kadesh': de Moor (1997: 256; for the רבבת as 'human warriors', see n. 230). For the discussion on other different readings, cf. S.R. Driver (1902: 392-3).

²⁸⁹ The act. ptc. form of the חבב, to 'love': BDB 285; HALOT 284-5; Cassuto (1973b: 51). Cf. LXX reads καὶ ἐφείσατο τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, 'and he spared his people', which presupposes עמו וחבב. Yet, since the subject of a participle can be omitted (cf. Kautzsch, 1910: §116; 3), the term may have the plural entities (the קדשם or אלים; see the discussion below on the orthographical reconstruction of the term) as its semantic subject. It is confirmed by Cross-Freedman (1948: 200 n. 13) who render the vocalization and translation of the second and third terms of the phrase to ḥôbebe' ammîm and to the 'guardians of the people'; thus they are the 'heavenly host who surround and accompany Yahweh', who may be identified as the קדשם who are taking their role as guardian deities. Seeligmann (1964: 81) also interprets that the חבב עמים are 'regarded here as ערת אלים phr ilm'.

²⁹⁰ LXX understands at this point as τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, 'his people', which presupposes עמו; otherwise, עמך, 'your people': Cassuto (1973b: 51). But the plural form of the עם, in MT, seems more probable here, as corresponding to the semantic plural subject of the חבב, if we accept: sc. אלים; thus, 'gods who love mortals'. See further discussion below.

²⁹¹ LXX reads ἡγιασμένοι, 'sanctified ones', and thus presupposes קדשים. Cf. Miller (1973: 81).

והם תכו לרגלך and they prostrate themselves²⁹³ at your foot;
 ישא מדברתיך they carry out²⁹⁴ your words²⁹⁵.

The descriptions begin with Yahweh's theophany. Yahweh is described here as dwelling on his mountain of many peaks, where myriads of chariots and thousands of lesser deities are with him (cf. Ps. 68:16-18 [ET 15-17])²⁹⁶. His theophany is accompanied with trembling and thundering there (cf. Ps 68.8-9 [ET 7-8]). Yahweh and his "angelic" army demonstrate his sovereignty and Yahweh reveals himself, at Mount Sinai²⁹⁷, as the 'divine warrior king'²⁹⁸ of the cosmic world.

²⁹² MT takes בידך at this place. The translation follows LXX, which reads the text as ὑπὸ τὰς χεῖράς αὐτοῦ, 'under his hands', and which presupposes בירי (cf. ט).

²⁹³ Whilst MT reads the text as והם תכו, it has been difficult to find the root of the second term. Finding the oldest reading of the text, Cross-Freedman (1948: 200-1 n. 16) read the first two terms of the phrase as combined הַתַּכּ *hmtakkû*; -t may be infixed into the variant *mk* of the \sqrt{mwk} or *mkk* (sc. Hithpael form). Cf. *HCLOT* 1471; *HALOT* 580: to 'bow oneself, become low' (Ps 106.43; Eccl 10.18 and Job 24.24); see its Ugaritic cognate: *DUL* 543; to 'fall'; cf. *KTU* 1.2 iv 17); and they read *h-* as a preformative. However, see their translation of v. 3 with their understanding of the subject of the verb not as gods, but as mortals. Differently, Milik (1957: 252) relates the first term to Ug. *hm*, 'lo, behold', and the second, unconvincingly, to the verb *tkk*, derived from Syr. and Ar., whose Hebrew noun form is *tōk*, 'oppression'. Cf. further discussion in Miller (1973: 81, 218 n. 46). De Moor (1997: 257 and n. 236) takes the *hm*, 'if', here as a variant of 'm as in Ugaritic.

²⁹⁴ Whilst MT reads ישא, to 'lift, carry, bear, transport' (*DCH* 758-70), without the *waw* consecutive, it is suggested that it is better read as ישא<ו>ם דברתיך (*BHS*). LXX reads a ו at this place; thus: καὶ ἐδέξατο ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ, 'and he received of his words'; but it makes more sense to take the ישא as a present: G.A. Smith (1918: 364). מ inserts the ו and read the verb as a pl. The MT reading is preferred here. Otherwise, Cross-Freedman (1948: 193, 201) take ישא as a *t*-infix verbal form.

²⁹⁵ MT reads מדברתיך; but it may be read as דברתיך after the restored ישאים.

²⁹⁶ For other similar expressions to v. 2, cf. Judg 5.4-5; Ps. 68.8-9 [ET 7-8]; Hab 3.3-4; and Ezek 1.4, 26-8.

²⁹⁷ Mount Sinai, which appears as the centre of the universal kingdom here, has the same theological importance as Mount Saphon in the Ugaritic texts. They are both the central sacred mountain in the world. The 'theological centrality' of Saphon appears to justify Baal's enthronement (*KTU* 1.6 vi 33-5). Wyatt (1996: 43) remarks: "Mount Saphon must have lain at the very heart of the religious consciousness of the people of Ugarit. It is in

2.2.1.1. Lesser Deities in the Original Text

The second colon of the second tricolon of MT begins with the **מימינו**. There have been various readings of the phrase following the **מימינו**²⁹⁹; thus numerous translations have been suggested with diverse readings of it: MT reads the last phrase as **למו דת**, 'a fiery law³⁰⁰ for them' (KJV); and LXX renders it to *ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ*, 'messengers with him'³⁰¹, which may presuppose **אלים** or **אלים שלו**³⁰².

As the result of their own orthographical approach³⁰³, the more probable reading is proposed by Cross and Freedman: **אלים אשר**, 'marched³⁰⁴ the gods³⁰⁵'. According to them, the ending **דת** is a present form restored from

this sense, rather than in a strictly geographical sense, that the mountain constituted the centre of the world".

²⁹⁸ Margulis (1969: 210).

²⁹⁹ See the discussion in S.R. Driver (1902: 390-1 n. 2).

³⁰⁰ Whilst Kethib takes the term as **אשרת**, Qere reads it separately as **דת אשר**. Ten Commandments (?): cf. Deut 9.10. Cf. Seeligmann (1964: 76, 77): **אשרת**, a 'fiery stream'.

³⁰¹ Cf. LXX on Deut 32.8; Ps 8.6; Job 1.6, 2.1, and 38.7.

³⁰² Cf. Acts 7.53; Gal 3.19; and Heb 2.2.

³⁰³ Cross-Freedman (1948: 193). In comparison with orthography, poetic diction, and structure of Northwest Semitic parallels, Cross-Freedman (*ibid.*, 192; and cf. n. 7) date the verse's composition most likely from the eleventh century B.C.E. at the earliest and suppose that it was possibly written down in the ninth century B.C.E. For the view of the early composition, cf. Gaster (1947b: 53) and Ginsberg (1948). If it is, it may possibly be related to the Ugaritic poetic style and metrical forms. In contrast to this view, see Murtonen (1953). The argument of R. Meyer (1961), based on M. Noth, that the text has the textual setting of the exilic period, which has been influenced from a Persian background, is cogently rejected by G. Cooke (1964: 36 n. 63), explaining that "for while the Persian satrap system coincides nicely with this mythological picture, it is not the only tenable historical basis for Deut 32.8 f.; the 'sons of gods' and 'heavenly assembly' motifs are so central and pervasive in ancient Near Eastern texts – especially Ugaritic – as to demand more serious consideration of pre-exilic settings for their occurrence in Israelite traditions".

³⁰⁴ Heb. **אשר**, to 'stride, go forward': HALOT 97; DCH 418-9. Cf. Ug. *atr*: DUL 126.

³⁰⁵ Adopting their reading, the **אלים** would be better translated as 'gods', rather than their own translation, 'mighty ones'. Cf. de Moor (1997: 256 and 257): "the other gods march with him as if they were his troops".

the damaged original signs of רֶא^{306} ; thus it is read possibly as אֶשֶׁר אֱלִים rather than a reading of MT, $\text{אֶשֶׁר דָּת לִמּוֹ}$; BHS also emends it similarly to $\text{אֱלִים אֶשֶׁר}^{307}$. It is conceivable that by around the tenth century B.C.E. the אֱלִים had undergone a configurative shift from a polytheistic designation to another theological identification.

As they mentioned, the similar usage of the verb אֶשֶׁר (cf. Prov 9.6) is found in the Ugaritic texts; in the dream of Keret, El appears and commends him to make his soldiers a mighty army:

$w\ l\ rbt\ km\ yr\ atr$	and by the myriad ³⁰⁸ like early rains ³⁰⁹ let
	them march ³¹⁰ ;
$tn\ tn\ hlk$	two (by) two let them proceed ³¹¹ ;
$atr\ tlt\ klhm$	let all of them march (in) three(s) ³¹²

(KTU 1.14 ii 40–42).

³⁰⁶ For their explained diagram, see Cross-Freedman (1948: 199 n. 11).

³⁰⁷ It is agreed, reluctantly, by Miller (1973: 79). Differently, Cassuto (1973b: 50) reads לִי , ‘unto Him’, in lieu of the לִמּוֹ .

³⁰⁸ Ug. $rb(b)t$, ‘ten thousand, myriad’: DUL 730-1. Cf. Akk. *ribbatu*: AHw 980; CAD 14[R] 314-7; Heb. רֶבֶבָה : HALOT 1175, 1178.

³⁰⁹ KTU² reads the text with a word-divider, which is doubted by Wyatt (2002: 190 n. 66). But Gaster divides and relates yr with the יִרְה , ‘rain of autumn’ (sc. ‘early rain’): see Herdner (1974: 517 n. c).

³¹⁰ Ug. tr ; to ‘march’: UT §19.424; DUL 126. Cf. Akk. *ašāru*: AHw 79; CAD 1/2[A] 420-22; Heb. אֶשֶׁר : HALOT 97. Whilst it is construed as a G. verb (del Olmo, 1981: 294; del Olmo-Sanmartín, 2004: 126), it may be best translated as a jussive: thus, de Moor (1987: 194) and Wyatt (2002: 191 and n. 67): a “classic verbal form (qatal || qatal) to balance it chiastically” with the hlk . Differently, as a preposition: Herdner (1974: 518 and n. d); Dietrich-Loretz (1984a) and Husser (1995: 125 and n. 29).

³¹¹ Ug. hlk , to ‘go, go away, run, flow, roam’: DUL 337. Cf. ‘proceed’: Wyatt (2002: 191).

³¹² The literal device used here is the climactic sequence of ‘n, n. || n + 1’ formula: cf. Wyatt (2002: 191 n. 68). Ug. tlt has been interpreted as a ‘set of three’ (sc. ‘three by three’): del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 909-10); or as the ‘infantry marching in twos and the chariotry riding in threes’: Wyatt (*ibid.*). But it may be better construed as the advancing infantry squad, constituted by a unit of six persons, marching in twos.

Ug. *atr*, a counterpart of אֲשֶׁר, is here used in a military setting. Similarly, the אֲשֶׁר may refer to a description of lesser deities' marching as Yahweh's armies³¹³. In doing so, the group of holy beings accompany Yahweh in his theophany.

2.2.1.2. Identity of the קְדָשִׁים

The identity of the קְדָשִׁים, 'holy ones', is disputed. Fuerst interprets them as mortals, translating the second colon of the third tricolon as 'and they are encamped at thy feet (at Sinai)'³¹⁴. But they can be understood, more probably, as the lesser deities of Yahweh (cf. Zech 14.5 and Ps 103.20), as most commentators say³¹⁵.

In the text some indications are evident of their inferior rank as lesser deities. First, as pointed out³¹⁶, the קְדָשִׁים and the אֱלִים restored in the second tricolon are paralleled in the Hebrew Bible elsewhere as the designations of the lesser deities (Ps 89.6-8; Exod 15.11, on the basis of LXX and Syriac; and possibly Hos 12.1)³¹⁷. Secondly, their subservient attitude such as bowing down at the feet of Yahweh, expressed in v. 3b of Deut 33, denotes their adoration of their supreme god and may describe their rank as the lesser agent deities in the divine assembly. Furthermore, the יָד in the first colon of Deut 33.3 may express metaphorically as well the 'power' (cf. Gen 9.2) of the

³¹³ It is read, less convincingly, as אֲשֶׁר, 'warriors', by Miller (1964: 241-3; 1973: 76, 79) following the suggestion of Beeston (1951), who relates to a South Arabic 'sd, 'lion'. In any case it may represent the military background.

³¹⁴ Fuerst (1867: 1471).

³¹⁵ Mowinckel (1962: [1] 150 n. 132); Christensen (2002: 836). Cf. Seeligmann (1964: 80-1) construes them as 'demonic beings', who are now guarding Yahweh. Seeligmann (*ibid.*, 80) interprets that the עֲמִים are 'regarded as a substitute for אֱלִים'.

³¹⁶ Cross-Freedman (1948: 199 n. 11).

³¹⁷ For the same motif, cf. Judg 5.4 and Hab 3.5.

sovereignty of Yahweh as it denotes literally 'hand'³¹⁸. Thus the phrase may indicate their status subordinate to Yahweh.

Therefore, the apparent semantic wordplay of the two designations, *אלים* and *קדשים*, in the second tricolon may be paralleled and identified with the *קדשים* in the third tricolon both functionally and poetically. Thus, the nature and role of the lesser deities are repeatedly stressed here; they are lesser 'gods' and they perform their roles as 'guardians' of mortals, giving an image of 'warriors'.

2.2.2. 1 Kings 22.19-22 (|| 2 Chronicles 18.18-21)

In the vision of Micaiah, Yahweh is described as enthroned over the assembly of divine beings; thus, v. 19 runs:

ראיתי את יהוה ישב על כסאו וכל צבא השמים עמד עליו מימינו
ומשמאלו

I saw Yahweh sitting on his throne and all the host of the
heavens standing by him on his right hand and on his left.

The half-colon *על כסאו ישב* denotes explicitly the divine kingship of Yahweh. As the enthroned king Yahweh is described as having the sovereignty of the cosmos, among other deities in his council (cf. Job 1-2; Isa 6 and, perhaps, Ezek 1)³¹⁹.

The *צבא השמים* are pictured here as squadrons arranged on both sides of Yahweh who is placed in the centre. In this respect, they seem to belong to the divine assembly as its members.

The nonverbal indications, which enable the reader to discern the rank of divine figures, are applied to the verse: the expression *עמד עליו* is used to

³¹⁸ HALOT 386-8.

³¹⁹ Gray (1964b: 402) cogently relates the conception of Yahweh's intervention in mortals' affairs from his throne to that of El's in a similar manner, issuing his decrees from his throne, and he points out that this is "originally borrowed from" Ugaritic mythology.

describe the position of the divine beings; one's standing position before the throne sat on by someone else can be evidence supporting one's rank as subordinate to the other who sits on the throne³²⁰; thus the status of the divine beings standing next to the throne of the supreme god may represent their ranking as subordinate deities (cf. Job 1.6; 2.1) who serve to dispense his decrees and messages³²¹.

The following verses further confirm the function of the council and the role of lesser deities. To the divine assembly falls the responsibility both for answering to a request from mortals and for their safeguarding of it. And, in the divine council, different opinions may be proposed for responding to Yahweh's question; the final decision should be made after discussion by the members of the divine council with various suggestions as at v. 20b:

וַיֹּאמֶר זֶה בָּכָה וְזֶה אָמַר בָּכָה

And one said this, and another said that³²².

The function of the Ugaritic divine council is similar to this³²³: the supreme god calls other gods into the divine council to volunteer to resolve an issue:

ltpn i[l d pid]

The Wise One, [the perceptive god³²⁴,
(asked)]:

³²⁰ In the royal court of mortals, ones in the lesser rank are supposed to stand before the higher one: Gen 45.1 (נָצַב and עָמַד); 1 Sam 16.21 (עָמַד); 2 Sam 13.31 (נָצַב); 1 Kgs 3.16 (עָמַד); 1 Kgs 10.8 (עָמַד); Prov 22.29 (יִחַיצֵב, the Hithpael form of יָצַב); and Dan 1.5 (עָמַד). They may sit merely after receiving permission from the higher god: Ps 110.1.

³²¹ Thus, Gray (1964b: 403) mentions that the phrase עָמַד עַל designates the "attitude of the subordinate, who stands while his superior sits or reclines on his divan". Jones (1984: 367) also refers them to the "heavenly beings or angels that act as God's servants".

³²² Its parallel passage in 2 Chr 18.19 reads כָּכָה ... כָּכָה in lieu of בָּכָה ... בָּכָה.

³²³ Jones (1984: 367) mentions that "the close parallel to the heavenly court found in Ugaritic mythology is sufficient evidence that it is not a late concept".

³²⁴ Ug. *ltpn* has been related to Ar. *lafif*, 'kind, benevolent': Bauer (1933: 83); Pope (1955: 146); Dahood (1958: 73); Gray (1965: 160); and de Moor (1971: 190-1; 1987: 23). Thus, it has been recognised to be analogous with the epithet of Yahweh: אֵל רַחוּם וְחַנּוּן, 'God (or El), Compassionate and Gracious' (Exod 34.6); or חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם, 'Gracious and Compassionate'

[my] <i>b ilm</i> [ydy mrš]	[Who] among the gods [will expel ³²⁵
	the sickness],
<i>gršm</i> z[bln]	will cast out ³²⁶ the i[liness]?]
[in b ilm] <i>ʿnyh</i>	[None of the gods] answered ³²⁷ him.
y[ny ylt] <i>rgm</i>	He repeated the question a
	sec[ond ³²⁸ , a third ³²⁹ time]

(KTU 1.16 v 10-4).

El summons the gods by means of messengers in order to heal sick Keret³³⁰. When the council is assembled, El asks who will heal Keret; the gods are responsible to answer this; but all of them fail to respond to El's request because it seems that no one is able to cure him. El's question is repeated seven times³³¹. These 'gods' (*ilm*) in the council are called 'sons' (*bn*) by El³³².

(Neh 9.17). For a semantic comparison with the phrase *ltpn ʿil dpʿid* and epithets of Yahweh, cf. Lindenberger (1982: 110-1 and 108 n. 21). On the other hand, more probably, Healey (1998: 350) interprets the phrase *ltpn ʿil dpʿid* as 'Laṭipān, the Perceptive God': Ug. *ltpn* which is the proper name of El, and Ug. *dpʿid* which is analogous with Ar. *dūfuʿād*, the 'one of heart'. He explains that Ar. *fuʿād* refers commonly to 'mental acuity' rather than 'kindnesses'. Cf. Herdner (1974: 564): 'le dieu au grand cœur'. Following Healey, Wyatt (2002: 48, etc.) translates it, more understandably, as the 'Wise One, the perceptive god' since wisdom is a feature of royalty; El is the king; thus, the phrase *ʿil dpʿid* may be understood here as the associated indication which explains the attribute of the term *ltpn*. Furthermore the context of the text confirms the fact that El is the wisest god in the divine council.

³²⁵ The basic meaning of Ug. *ydy* is 'to throw': Watson (1999: 789). See DUL 958: to 'throw, eject, expel, repel'. Cf. Heb. ירה: HALOT 389; and Akk. *nadû*: CAD 11/1[N] 68-100.

³²⁶ Ug. *grš*, to 'eject, drive out, evict, cast out': DUL 309 (cf. Heb. גרש: HALOT 204). Herdner (1974: 564 n. b) construes the *gršm* as an infinitive plus a *-m* suffix.

³²⁷ Ug. *ʿny*, to 'answer, say': DUL 172-3. Cf. Heb. ענה: HALOT 851-2.

³²⁸ Ug. *iny*, to 'repeat, reiterate': DUL 924. Its noun form, *tn*, denotes 'two, twice'. Cf. Heb. שנה: HALOT 1598-9; Aram. *tny*: DNWSI 1223; Akk. *šanû*; AHw 1165-6; CAD 17/2[Š].

³²⁹ The D. form of the Ug. *√lt*; cf. DUL 907: to 'repeat for the third time'.

³³⁰ Cf. KTU 1.16 iv.

³³¹ Cf. KTU 1.16 v 14-22.

³³² *tb bny*, 'sit, my sons': KTU 1.16 v 24.

Returning to the biblical Hebrew texts, it is clearly described that when a divine being is supposed to give his opinion, he should be standing before Yahweh sitting on the throne; v. 21a follows:

ויצא הרוח	And a spirit ³³³ came forward,
ויעמד לפני יהוה	and stood in the face of Yahweh,
ויאמר	and said ... ³³⁴ .

Then a certain divine being who makes a proposal which is accepted by Yahweh, is commissioned by Yahweh to undertake the task (v. 22). Thus we see the fact that after a discussion in the council, a task is given commonly from the supreme god to his divine agent, who executes his mission. Therefore it is implicit that he is designated as a lesser deity subordinate to Yahweh as accomplishing the mission charged by his master god.

2.2.3. Psalm 29

In the description of the text, gods other than Yahweh appear as the lesser deities. The text reads:

הבו ליהוה בני אלים Give³³⁵ to Yahweh, the Sons of El³³⁶;

³³³ This lesser deity is called as the רוח, which means 'breath, wind, spirit': BDB 924-6; HALOT 1197-1201. Various interpretations have been suggested for this term. De Vries (1978: 45) construes it as 'the spirit of revelation', emphasising the article ה. Gray (1964b: 403) suggests that this supernatural being may be recognised as a personified form of the Holy Spirit at a 'very primitive level', rather than as Satan. However, it may be more likely referring to a lesser deity since Yahweh's divine agent (messenger) can be described as the רוח (cf. Ps 104.4 and further discussion on the verse in Chapter III). Jones (1984: 368) properly explains the הרוח as a generic designation: thus, 'a' rather than 'the'.

³³⁴ For the standing position of lesser deities 'before Yahweh', cf. Job 1.6; 2.1. Also see 'פני יהוה' in Job 1.12 and 2.7. For mortals' standing before Yahweh, cf. Jer 23.18, 22; and Isa 6.

³³⁵ The impv. masc. pl. form of the יהב, to 'give, provide, ascribe': BDB 396; HALOT 236. The threefold repetition of the הבו constructs a parallelism and it functions to open a speech; the same pattern occurs as well in Ugaritic: Watson (1984: 152-4).

³³⁶ Or, 'God'. A few Mss attest אילים (BHS). Whilst the בני אלים is understood as the 'divine beings' who belong to the class of gods (Kautzsch, 1910: §128, v; Paul Joüon, 1923: §129, j), the ם of the second element can be read also as an enclitic; then, the י may be added

הבו ליהוה כבוד ועז give to Yahweh honour and strength;

הבו ליהוה כבוד שמו give to Yahweh the honour of his name.

השתחויו ליהוה בהדרת קדש Bow down to Yahweh in the court of the holy ones³³⁷

(Ps 29.1b-2).

Since Ginsberg's initial studies³³⁸, Ps 29 has been intensively examined to discover the affinities between the Hebrew and Ugaritic texts. The expression בני אלים, 'sons of El (or God)', in the opening call in v. 1 is regarded as evidence of the fact that this psalm is the metamorphosis of a Canaanite hymn: its Ugaritic cognate *bn ilm* is frequently found in the Ugaritic texts³³⁹.

later (Hummel, 1957: 101; Freedman, 1960: 104-5; Cross, 1973: 45-6, 152; and Kloos, 1986: 16). Wyatt (1996: 347) provides a possibility to interpret it as a genitive form with an enclitic, as it is in Ugaritic (*ili*, a genitive form of *ilu*). The phrase clearly expresses a polytheistic view: Weiser (1962: 262). We shall discuss later the filial sense of the expression in Chapter II.

³³⁷ LXX reads the phrase as ἐν αὐτῇ ἁγίᾳ αὐτοῦ, 'in his holy court'. The first element may be corrected as בהצרה: Wyatt (1996: 270, 34). A conjecture, by Cross (1950: 20-1; 1973: 155-6) and Kraus (1988-9: [1] 344), of a relation between Heb. הדרת and Ug. *hdrt*, 'appearance, vision' (KTU 1.14 i 36; iii 51), is doubted by Caquot (1956); Donner (1967: 331-7); Loretz (1974: 185-6; 1988: 151-4); Dietrich-Loretz (1984b); and Avishur (1994: 53). LXX and S then read the last term as קדשו with a 3. m. sg. ending. The original reading may be, however, a plural form to indicate other divine members of Yahweh's court.

³³⁸ Ginsberg (1936a and 1938a).

³³⁹ For other evidence; 1) Yahweh's voice is praised like Baal's voice is praised in the Ugaritic texts; 2) all of three TNs, לבנון (Lebanon, v. 5 and 6); שרין (Sirion, v. 6); and מדבר קדש (the 'wilderness of Kadesh', v. 8), are located in Syria and found in the Ugaritic texts as well; 3) the pattern of the enthronement of Yahweh after defeating his enemies is very similar to that of Baal in the Ugaritic texts; thus, the blessing to the Israelites in v. 11 was not an original part of the psalm but added to the borrowed form of a Ugaritic hymn: Ginsberg (1936a: 129-31; and 1938a: 472-6); followed by Cross (1973: 151-6) and Fitzgerald (1974), whilst denied by Gaster (1946a) for being corrected as the original part; and lastly, 4) the climactic parallelism in this psalm is also found in the Ugaritic texts (Ginsberg, 1936a: 180-1). Additionally it is suggested by Albright (1950a: 6) that this adaptation from the Baal hymn was taken probably in or around the tenth century B.C.E., although others reject Ginsberg's

The **אלים בני** clearly occurs to denote the 'gods' in heaven to 'praise Yahweh, identified with El'³⁴⁰. The original expression of **אלים בני**³⁴¹ in other texts then seems to have been replaced by other terms at a later date: it may be substituted by the phrase *mšphwt* 'mym in its parallels (cf. Ps 96.7 and 1 Chr 16.28)³⁴².

In the psalm, the **אלים בני** appear clearly as being of a status lower than Yahweh. They function here as divine chanters³⁴³ to pay homage to Yahweh by prostrating themselves (**השתחויו**) before him as his lesser 'gods'³⁴⁴. Their attitude before Yahweh denotes their rank as a nonverbal indication, as well as designates the same explicitly in the **ישתחויו** at Ps 86.9.

Avishur supposes that the **כבוד (הבו)** and **השתחויו** are paralleled in v. 2, as elsewhere (Ps 86.9; 96.8-9)³⁴⁵. In regard to this, Ugaritic parallels occur ten times³⁴⁶. Furthermore, their rank is stressed in v. 9b:

ובהיכלו כלו אמר כבוד And in his temple his all says, 'Glory'.

theory: cf. Weiser (1962: 261 n. 1); Margulis (1970); Craigie (1972; and 1983: 68-71); Freedman-Hyland (1973); Cunchillos (1976b); Avishur (1979; and 1994: esp. 39-61); Macholz (1980) and Kloos (1986: 98-112). J. Day (1979; 1985: 59) cogently identifies the seven voices of Yahweh with the seven thunders of Baal (KTU 1.101.3).

³⁴⁰ Wyatt (1996: 348).

³⁴¹ Cf. this phrase occurs only at Ps 89.7; or probably at Deut 32.8 as well. Avishur (1994: 44-5) insists that these evidences elsewhere do not support the original Ugaritic composition of this psalm. However, the Ugaritic relevance is seen even in Ps 89: conceptions of the divine assembly similar to the Ugaritic pantheon; and the designation for the lesser deities, **קדשם**, comparable with the Ugaritic expression *bn qdš*, the 'Sons of the Holy One' or 'Holy Ones'. See, analyses on Ps 89.6-9 in Chapter II.

³⁴² Cf. Ginsberg (1936a: 129-31); and Avishur (1994: 84).

³⁴³ Lesser deities' function as divine chanters will be discussed later in Chapter V.

³⁴⁴ Cf. Weiser (1962: 262); Brueggemann (1984: 142-3).

³⁴⁵ Avishur (1994: 80-1); in n. 152, he explains that "*hābū kəbōd* here is equivalent to *kabbedu*"; this usage, in which a verb-noun combination appears in parallel with another verb, is a common pairing mode, used to attain metric balance".

³⁴⁶ Thus: *tšthwy kbd* (KTU 1.3 iii 10); *tšthwy w kbd* (KTU 1.1 iii 3; 1.3 vi 19-20 and 1.4 viii 28-9); *tšthwy w tkbdh* (1.4 iv 26); *tšthwy w tkbdnh* (KTU 1.6 i 38 and 1.17 vi 50-1); *yšthwy w ykbdnh* (KTU 1.1 iii 25 and 1.2 iii 6); and *yšthwyn w ykbdnh* (KTU 1.1 ii 16).

Yahweh is sitting in his palace/temple, which indicates his divine court³⁴⁷. There, the divine beings attribute honour to Yahweh. He deserves their praise for he is the cosmic ruler³⁴⁸ as at v. 10:

יהוה למבול ישב Yahweh sat upon the flood;

וישב יהוה מלך לעולם and Yahweh sat (as) King for ever³⁴⁹.

Avishur argues that whilst these deities appear as being lesser than Yahweh, the *bn ilm* in the Ugaritic texts are not clearly described as being lesser than El³⁵⁰; accordingly, it cannot be accepted that the text originated from the Ugaritic texts. However the Ugaritic texts allude nonverbally to the relation of the *bn ilm* with El as the subordinates and their principal³⁵¹.

The setting of the text suggests a scene in the royal court, which is found also in the description of Isa 6.5 where 'the king, Yahweh of hosts' (המלך יהוה צבאות) is seated upon the throne. It reflects the same theme of kingship within the divine assembly dealt with in the Ugaritic mythological texts.

In addition to Ginsberg's suggestions, Gaster supposes that the mythical background of Ps 29 has a great affinity with the Ugaritic poem in its pattern of the enthronement of the king at the cultic centre³⁵²: Baal defeats

³⁴⁷ Parker (1999c: 798).

³⁴⁸ Rowley (1967: 251-2).

³⁴⁹ Yahweh's throne is situated in the heavens (cf. Ps 11.4; 103.19 and Isa 66.1).

³⁵⁰ Avishur (1994: 45) cites a remark by Loewenstamm (1980: 157), saying that there is no indication of their prostration to El.

³⁵¹ We have discussed already their lesser status in the divine assembly above. Also, cf. discussions on their filial relationship to El in Chapter II.

³⁵² Gaster (1946a: 56-7): the Baal Cycle was probably the "cult-myth of the seasonal festival, its main episodes corresponding to the main stages of the ritual"; cf. Gaster (1934: 678-81). In fact, Gaster (1933: 382 n. 13) is the first one who has drawn attention to an issue of the affinities between Ps 29 and the Ugaritic texts. However, Wyatt (1996: especially, 142-58) rejects this theory, respectively, of Gaster (1950) and de Moor (1971; 1972; 1987), *et al.*, which 'discerns through the allegory of the gods and their actions the flow of the seasons and the

his antagonist Yam³⁵³; thereby acquiring dominion, he is inaugurated as the king of the gods; therefore he is worshiped by gods lesser than himself, Kothar-and-Hasis (KTU 1.2 iv); and he claims his own palace (sc. a temple)³⁵⁴. Thus, he says that Ps 29 is a 'typical "hymn of laudation" detached from its mythic context, Yahwized and preserved as an independent liturgical composition'³⁵⁵.

Cross also supports Ginsberg's theory, saying that two patterns are found in this psalm: first, the march of the Divine Warrior to battle, bearing his terrible weapons, the thunder-bolt and the winds; and secondly, his victorious return from battle to his new temple on his newly-won mount, and his enthronement as king there³⁵⁶. Therefore, Yahweh is supreme over other divine beings³⁵⁷.

Wyatt suggests that the formula of Ps 29.1-2 has been altered from an 'older text' in which the 'gods', rather than the 'people' in a liturgical setting in the temple, were originally invoked to sing, as seen in Job 38.7 and Ps 8.3³⁵⁸.

agricultural year'. He suggests rather that the *Chaoskampf* in the Ugaritic texts represents the kingship theme (ideology), which came from its *Sitz im Leben* in Ugarit.

³⁵³ In Ps 93, Yahweh's power is overwhelming the intensive force of the antagonistic Rivers (נהרות, v. 3) or Sea (ים, v. 4) and is comparable with Judge Nahar [River] (*ṯpṯ nhr*) or Prince Yam [Sea] (*zbl ym*) in the Ugaritic texts (KTU 1.2 iii 7-8, 16 and 21-3, etc.). Cf. Hab 3.8. Gaster (1937: 24-5) emphasises that the Yahweh cult that occurs in Ps 93 is formatted from a story of Baal fighting with Yam in the Ugaritic myth. Gaster (1969: 771) possibly supposes that the tetragrammaton in Ps 93 is substituted for Ug. *bʿl* (Baal). Fitzgerald (1974) plausibly suggests that if the tetragrammaton is substituted by Ug. *bʿl*, the text is to be more alliterative for Ug. *bʿl* occurs in every colon in Ps 29, although this view is contradicted by O'Connor (1977).

³⁵⁴ Cf. KTU 1.4 vi: when Baal's palace is completed, an inaugural banquet is held.

³⁵⁵ Gaster (1946a: 57).

³⁵⁶ Cross (1973: 155-6).

³⁵⁷ Cf. Exod 15.11; Deut 3.24; 1 Kgs 8.23; Ps 86.8; 95.3; 96.4; 97.7, 9; 103.20 and 21, etc. With a similar aspect, the Ugaritic god El appears also as the supreme king ruling over other lesser deities, who are represented as his 'sons'.

³⁵⁸ Wyatt (1996: 349).

From the evidence of these parallels, Holladay implies that 'there was in Syria-Palestine a shared cultural tradition of poetry-building that included both the Canaanites in the Late Bronze Age (1500-1200 B.C.E.) or earlier, from whom we have the Ugaritic texts, and the Israelites who had settled in the land of Canaan by a time just before 1200 B.C.E., from whom we have early Hebrew poetry, including early psalms'³⁵⁹. Thus it may be concluded that the psalm reflects the early theology of Syro-Palestinian religions in regard to the divine kingship and lesser deities.

2.2.4. Daniel 7.10b

In the vision of Daniel the entities of lesser deities may be portrayed:

אלף אלפים ישמשונו	A thousand (upon) thousands ³⁶⁰
	were serving ³⁶¹ him;
ורבו רבון קדמוהי יקומו	and a myriad (upon) myriads were
	standing ³⁶² before him.
דינא יתב	The court ³⁶³ was seated.

³⁵⁹ Holladay (1993: 21). Fensham (1963a: 96) interestingly suggests that it may be adopted for a missionary purpose: "there exists a possibility that this psalm was intended as a missionary poem to make proselytes of Canaanites or as an evangelizing psalm to convert an apostate Israelite from a servant of Baal to a worshipper of Yahweh".

³⁶⁰ Qere reads the text as a plural (אלפין), whilst Kethib takes it as a dual (אלפים).

³⁶¹ The tenses of ישמשונו (pacl, impf.) and יקומו (peal, impf.) are suggested here as habitual; thus, translated as continuous actions: S.R. Driver (1900: 86 and cf. 49); and cf. NASB. It may express the constant service of the lesser deities to their master god.

³⁶² The יקומו represents their attendance in the council: S.R. Driver (1900: 86); NAB; NJPS; and NRSV.

³⁶³ The Aram. דין denotes 'judgment' (CHALOT 402; HALOT 1852). Yet it seems to be used here in a sense of *judges* with the יתב, to 'sit, be seated'. LXX reads as κριτήριον, 'court'. It may connote the other divine members of the court of judgment, held by Yahweh (cf. Ps 82.1).

In these Aramaic passages the members of the divine assembly are described in a poetic device; thus, the countless number of divine beings denotes a cosmic multitude of the divine assembly³⁶⁴.

These numerous divine beings 'stand' (יִקְוּמוּן, in v. 10b) before the 'Ancient of Days' (עַתִּיק יוֹמִין) who 'sits' (יֹתֵב, in v. 9a) on 'his throne' (כְּרִסִּיהָ, in v. 9b). The Ancient of Days or Yahweh³⁶⁵ is presiding over the judicial assembly³⁶⁶. He sits on his own throne as the judge. Then other divine entities are portrayed as attending the court of judgment, held by their supreme god.

Whilst the members of the divine legal 'court' (רִינָא) 'sit' (יֹתֵב, in v. 10b), other divine beings 'stand' (קָאמִיא, in v. 16a; cf. Dan 7.16)³⁶⁷. The positions of 'sitting' and 'standing' explicitly act as nonverbal indications,

³⁶⁴ These numerous divine figures indicate the 'vast angelic bureaucracy' which are related closely to the 'ten thousands of holy ones' in Deut 33.2 (also cf. 1 Kgs 22.19; Jer 33.22; Zech 14.5), identified as other 'gods' of the divine assembly and 'later become the "angels"' (Jude 14): cf. Wyatt (1996: 395 n. 40). During the transformation of the polytheistic view into the theology of "monotheism", their identity as the 'gods' in the bureaucratic pantheon seems to have been replaced with that as the "angels" with their absolute master god.

³⁶⁵ Whilst Persian influence has been suggested as to the עַתִּיק יוֹמִין, Ugaritic reference has been linked also for evidence of its origin. Eissfeldt (1965: 525) suggests that the conception of the עַתִּיק יוֹמִין is adopted from a Syrian mythological background. Hence it has been related to the Ugaritic phrase *mlk ab šnm* (KTU 1.1 iii 24; [1.2 iii 5]; [1.3 v 8]; 1.4 iv 24; [1.5 vi 2]; 1.6 i 36; 1.17 vi 49), translated as the 'King, Father of years': Porteous (1965: 107); Gibson (1978: 53). However, the phrase is best translated as the 'King, Father of Bright Ones' (sc. Father of lesser deities; cf. Oldenburg, 1969: 17-8), whose meaning cultivates incongruence for a semantic comparison with the current Hebrew phrase. Further discussion of the *ab šnm* shall be made in Chapter II. Although the Ugaritic references are irrelevant, there are still many other possibilities in Dan 7 to admit the Ugaritic mythological influence (Emerton, 1958). Therefore, the עַתִּיק יוֹמִין is identified, most possibly, as 'Yahweh': Zevit (1968: 392).

³⁶⁶ In v. 9, the phrase כְּרִסִּין רַמְיוּ, 'thrones were placed' (the רַמְיוּ: the Peil, pf. 3. masc. pl. form of the Aram. רָמָה, to 'throw, place': HALOT 1982. Cf. Heb. רָמָה: BDB 941; GHCLOTS 770; HALOT 431) indicates the judicial characteristic of the divine council.

³⁶⁷ It may denote the fact that there are two levels of lesser deities: higher deities participating in the court as its members and other lesser deities serving Yahweh.

designating the rank between the higher deities and the lesser³⁶⁸. The scene of the divine assembly is pictured very similarly to that of 1 Kgs 22.19. Thus, numberless servant deities of Yahweh in the text represent clearly the fact that they are the lesser deities of Yahweh.

Summary

The rank of lesser deities in the divine assembly in the Hebrew Bible corroborates the hierarchical structure of the divine assembly, which consists of the supreme god and his lesser deities. As in the Ugaritic texts, the divine rank of lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible is distinguished also by non-verbal indicators: e.g., the lesser deities' standing posture in the heavenly council (Deut 33.2-3; 1 Kgs 22.19-22 [= 2 Chr 18.18-21]; Ps 29; and Daniel 7.10b).

Conclusion to Chapter I

The Ugaritic conception that lesser deities are members of the divine assembly is also found in the Hebrew Bible. This apparent polytheistic setting of Ugaritic and Hebrew descriptions implies the fact that the divine assembly consists of the supreme god and other lesser gods and that the sovereignty of the supreme god is associated with his lesser deities. Thus, he summons the divine assembly and asks opinions from them in order to make a decree or decision, although the supreme god seems to have his own absolute authority. The decision made in the assembly is brought by the messenger deities, who are identified as gods. These lesser gods are addressed as numerous and anonymous, and as the members of the divine assembly.

The Hebrew texts retain some mythological terms by which the earliest structure of the divine assembly can be detected. In the early period

³⁶⁸ The divine judge may arise only when he gives the sentence (cf. Ps 82.1).

of Israelite religion, the entity of divine beings other than Yahweh has not been denied. They have been transferred to the lesser deities in a lower rank in its later period. However, the Hebrew writers tend to establish the absolute authority of Yahweh creatively; he is only the head in the divine assembly (cf. 1 Kgs 8.23; Pss 89.7; 96.45; and 95.3); all others become his servant deities.

CHAPTER TWO:

Kinship of Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible

Introduction

The identity of lesser deities as 'sons' of their master deity, which is attested in a variety of their titles, is the crux of the discussion in this chapter. It is clearly described in Ugaritic mythological texts that the supreme god El has a paternal relationship with the secondary gods. To find references to this theogony in the Ugaritic texts is not difficult: the core-involved second gods such as Baal¹, Anat², Mot³, and other gods, appear as his son or his daughter⁴; and the peripheral second gods, such as the Gracious Gods, are also fathered by El⁵. Other lesser deities as well as the secondary gods may have the same filial relationship to the supreme god, defined as his 'sons'.

¹ Baal has been argued as a son of Dagan (*bn dgn*: KTU 1.2 i 19, etc.), not as a son of El: Kapelrud (1952: 52-6, 64-6). Yet he is referred to, more probably, as a son of El: *tr il abh*, 'Bull El, his Father'; thus, see KTU 1.3 v 35-6 (|| KTU 1.4 iv 47-8):

<i>any l yṣḥ tr il abh</i>	Sighing, he cries to Bull El his father
<i>il mlk d yknnh</i>	(to) El the king who created him'.

Cf. Wyatt (2002: 87 n. 75; for his further discussion on *bn dgn*; also, cf. Wyatt, 1980; 1992a: 408 [§6]; and 1996: 42 n. 44). Ug. *ab* and *kn* occur here as having a semantic parallel: Dahood (1972: 96; cf. 327, recognising KTU 1.10 iii 6-7 || Deut 32.6). The phrase *aliyn bn b'l* occurs only once in KTU 1.5 ii 17-18, whilst the normal epithet given to Baal elsewhere is *aliyn b'l*, 'Mightiest Baal', as at KTU 1.5 ii 6 and 10. Ug. *bn* at this place is understood as a dittography: del Olmo (1981: 217). Since Baal is described as having his kinsmen (KTU 1.4 vi 44-6, etc.), he may be regarded as the eldest or, at least, the strongest one in his divine family.

² The goddess Anat is mentioned as the *aḥt* ('sister') of Baal (KTU 1.3 iv 39; 1.10 ii 16, 20) and called *bt* ('daughter') by El (KTU 1.3 v 27; 1.18 i 16).

³ Cf. *bn ilm mt*, 'Son of El, Mot': KTU 1.4 vii 45-6, etc.; and in the descriptions Mot is addressed as *aḥy*, 'my brother', by Anat: KTU 1.6 ii 12.

⁴ Cf. Cassuto (1971: 54).

⁵ Cf. KTU 1.23.

What is of the first importance in this study is to make enquiries, through philological analyses, into some 'kinship' titles of the lesser deities⁶ and the Ugaritic corpus related to this subject⁷. Then we will compare them with similar designations found in the Hebrew Bible⁸ and the biblical Hebrew references⁹. The outward appearance of lesser deities portrayed in the Ugaritic texts¹⁰ will also be investigated through iconography. The results from the study will be compared with the descriptions found in the Hebrew Bible¹¹.

⁶ The terms will be selected from the work of Wyatt (1998b: 41-58): thus, Ug. *ab šnm*; *bn ilm* (*ab bn il*; *il bn il*); *bnt il* (*bnt*; *bnt il*; *bnt hll*); *bn aṭrt*; *bn qdš*, etc.

⁷ It will examine some important Ugaritic texts relevant to the issue: KTU 1.2 i 19-21; 1.3 v 36-40; 1.4 ii 21-6; 1.4 vi 44-6; 1.6 v 1-4; 1.16 i 9-11, etc.

⁸ Some Hebrew terms will be treated in Part II: בני (ה)אלהים (or בני אלהם); בני עליין; קדשים, etc.

⁹ In Part II, some biblical Hebrew passages will be analysed: Gen 6.2, 4; Deut 32.8; Job 1.6; 2.1; Pss 82.6-7; 89.6-9; and Exod 15.11, etc.

¹⁰ The study will analyse KTU 1.2 i 11-3; 1.12 i 28-32, etc.

¹¹ It will treat mainly Judg 13.6 and Eccl 10.20.

PART I. Kinship Relation of Lesser Deities to Their Master God in the Ugaritic Texts

Some Ugaritic terms that indicate the kinship relation of lesser deities to their master god(dess) will be examined in this part. The outward appearance of Ugaritic lesser deities will be also scrutinised to see if there is any clue to confirm their kinship relation.

1. The Kinship Terms for Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts

El is known as the *ḥtk*¹², the 'Progenitor' of all individual gods; thus, he is regarded as the *ab bn il*¹³, 'Father of the Sons of El'¹⁴, or the *il bn il*¹⁵, 'El of the Sons of El'. From these facts, lesser deities can be inferred as 'sons' of El, with a filial sense.

1.1. *ab šnm* 'Father of Bright Ones'

Although the phrase *ab šnm*¹⁶ is a designation for the supreme god, it may be evidently suggested as an indication of the kinship relation of lesser deities to El. Whilst it has been variously translated, it may be best taken as 'Father of Bright Ones'.

The translation of the phrase as 'Père des années'¹⁷ has been rejected because the Ugaritic term for the meaning of 'year(s)', whether it is a sg. or a

¹² Ug. *ḥtk*, 'progenitor, father' (de Moor, 1971: 241; *DUL* 375 [I], from the $\sqrt{\text{ḥtk}}$, to 'subdue, control'; cf. Heb. חָתַךְ : *HALOT* 364), occurs at KTU 1.1 ii 18; 1.1 iii 6; and 1.6 iv 11.

¹³ KTU 1.40.7, 16, 24, 33, 41; and 1.122.2.

¹⁴ Pedersen (1939: 4) remarks that El is the 'father of gods'.

¹⁵ KTU 1.65.1.

¹⁶ KTU 1.1 iii 24; 1.2 i 10; 1.2 iii [5]; 1.3 v 8; 1.4 iv 24; 1.5 vi 2; 1.6 i 36; and 1.17 vi 49.

¹⁷ Virolleaud (1931: 198; 1932: 132, 137); Bauer (1933: 82); followed by Clifford: (1972: 48); Gibson (1978: 53); del Olmo (1981: 165); and de Moor (1987: 16 n. 83): "an epithet describing Ilu as the oldest among the gods".

pl., occurs only in its feminine form *šnt*¹⁸. O. Eissfeldt's suggestion, 'Vater der Sterblichen', derived from the $\sqrt{\text{šny}}$, to 'wechseln, dahinschwinden'¹⁹, has also been doubted for the $\sqrt{\text{šny}}$ is never used to denote 'mortals'^{20, 21}.

However, the second term of the expression *ab šnm* seems to be more explicable in regard to El's absolute authority in the pantheon. When Ug. *mlk* occurs with the phrase *ab šnm* it seems to be somewhat associated semantically with the *šnm*, although it appears to modify the preceding noun *qrš*, 'pavilion'²²: thus, *qrš mlk ab šnm*²³. Ug. *mlk* and *ab* occur as being paralleled in this case to indicate the two positional characteristics of the supreme god ruling in the pantheon: sc. the ruler of other gods as well as the father of them.

¹⁸ Ginsberg (1936b: 164); accepted by Pope (1955: 32-5); Oldenburg (1969: 17). Thus it is not related in any case to the Hebrew divine epithet *עתיק יומין*, 'Ancient of Days', in Dan 7.9.

¹⁹ Eissfeldt (1951: 30-1 n. 4).

²⁰ Pope (1955: 33). For other suggestions, see Pope (*ibid.*: 32-3).

²¹ Meanwhile, Ug. *šnm* occurs also in a pair of nouns; cf. *trmn* (it should be read as *tkmn*) w *šnm*: KTU 1.65.4; also, KTU 1.39.3, 6; 1.40.[8, 17, 25], 34, 43; 1.41.[12, 15], 31; 1.87.14, 17, 33-4; 1.114:18-9; 1.122.[4]; and 1.123.8. Thus, a DN and a DN. Eissfeldt's view (1945-9; 1951: 66-9), which relates the second term of the *ab šnm* to a DN of a Kassite deity (Shumaliya) is rejected by Pope (1955: 32-3) for its 'minor, nondescript, and problematic role in the Ugaritic pantheon'. Instead Pope (*ibid.*: 32) refers it to 'Shunem', without any definition. Wyatt (1990: 446-8; 1996: 45 n. 54, 227-9; 2002: 46 n. 39, 410 n. 35) hypothetically renders it to 'Shanimu', a dawn-goddess of Indian Vedic origin, "brought to Babylonia by the Kassites under the name of *Šumaliya*"; hence, he identifies a pair of DNs with the Kassite deities, Shuqamuna and Shumaliya. With the same etymology of Shumaliya, he translates the *šnm* as 'Bright One' (Wyatt, 2002: 46).

²² Ug. *qrš*; cf. Akk. *g/quršu* (AHw 299; CAD 5[G] 141; a 'room' in a private house), *karāšu*, *karšu* (CAD 8[K] 210-2; 'camp, encampment'). Thus, 'pavilion': Virolleaud (1931: 198); Wyatt (2002: 46 and n. 38); 'tent-shrine/tent-frame': Clifford (1972:48, 54); or 'camp': Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 192). This appears as the residence of El in the Ugaritic texts. Yahweh had also been a tent resident (2 Sam 7.6); cf. Wyatt (1996: 28).

²³ KTU 1.1 iii 24; [1.2 iii 5]; [1.3 v 8]; 1.4 iv 24; 1.5 vi 2; 1.6 i 36; and 1.17 vi 49.

Thus another plausible connection, suggested by Pope²⁴, with Ar. *snw*; *sny*, to 'shine, be high, exalted, old', is noteworthy here; hence, it is referred to 'Father of Exalted Ones' or 'Exalted Father'. Whilst accepting Pope's etymological application, however, its translation is preferred hereafter, most likely, to that of Oldenburg: the 'King, the Father of the Luminaries'²⁵; or the 'Father of the Bright Ones'. Therefore, El's epithet 'Father of the Bright Ones' may represent the radiant theophany of the lesser deities who are bonded with their filial relationship to their king El²⁶.

1.2. *bn il(m²⁷)* 'Sons of El'

The phrase implies evidently the theogony of lesser deities²⁸. As other secondary gods lesser deities may be also regarded as 'sons' of the supreme god.

²⁴ It was proposed originally by Thomas (1934: 236-8); but suggested, with some developed ideas, again by Pope (1955: 33-5).

²⁵ Oldenburg (1969: 17-8) construes Ug. *šnm* as a masc. pl. noun form of the *√sny* which corresponds to Ar. *√sny*, to 'gleam, shine'.

²⁶ El's Ug. epithet may have been related later to Yahweh's Gk. designation τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φῶτων, 'of the Father of the Lights' (James 1.17), as Oldenburg (1969: 17-9) points out. Its references go further to other texts: KTU 1.10 i 3-5, which read *bn il* [*phr kkbm* [*dr dt šmm*, 'Sons of El; || the assembly of Stars; || circle of those of heavens'; cf. Job 38.7; Isa 14.13.

²⁷ Whilst the expression *bn ilm* appears as the epithet for Mot in 1.4 vii 45-6; 1.4 viii 16, 30, etc., it occurs only once for all the deities of the pantheon at KTU 1.4 iii 14: *phr bn ilm*, the 'assembly of the sons of El'; the *-m* occurs as an enclitic at this place. The *m* enclitic is attested in Mari names like *Ab-du-ma-Da-gan*, 'Servant of Dagan' (ARM 15: 140; cf. 144), and in a variety of uses in Amarna as well as in Hebrew; for this, cf. Hummel's work (1957: 87-103).

²⁸ For the studies on the Ugaritic expression *bn il*, see Cunchillos (1969: 5-17) and Jüngling (1969: 53-6). Cunchillos (1985a: 206) adequately divides the usage of the phrase *bn il* or *bn ilm* into three categories: firstly, for the gods as 'sons of El' (KTU 1.40; 1.65; and 1.122, etc.); secondly, for a hero divinised as a 'son of El' (KTU 1.16); thirdly, for the theophanic PNs in some economic texts (KTU 4.63; 4.84, etc.). He (Cunchillos, *ibid.*: 209) says also that the Ugaritians believed the kinship of human beings to gods and 'des dieux se fait par génération'. However, the expression *ab adm*, 'Father of humans' (KTU 1.14 i 37, 43; 1.14 iii

In KTU 1.23, it is evidently described that from his two daughters (*bnt il*) El gave birth to two sons, Shahar and Shalem²⁹, who are entitled as *ilm n'mm*, 'Gracious Gods'³⁰, or *bn šp[š]*, 'Sons of Shap[sh]'³¹, or *tn šrm*, 'two Princes'³² by the poet³³.

32, 47; 1.14 v 43; 1.14 vi 13 and 32) does not indicate literally El's paternal relationship to a human being; cf. Ryan (1954: 73): the life and health of Keret, as a normal human, depend on El; and Wyatt (1994a: 147-8): the *ab adm* does not mean "'father of mankind" in a generalised sense so much as "father of the Primal Man (Adam)"; also cf. Wyatt (1986c: 422). This rather implies a divine kingship in Ugaritic royal ideology; cf. del Olmo (1981: 277): in a 'sense of adaptation'; and Wyatt (2002: 183-4 n. 30). King Keret is also called ideologically *bn(m) il*, the 'son of El' (KTU 1.16 i 10, 20; and 1.16 ii 48; and cf. *tr abh il*, 'Bull, his Father, El' at KTU 1.14 ii 6), as well as *glm il*, 'Heir of El' (KTU 1.14 i 40-1). Therefore it is clear that the authority of a mortal king was stressed through his exclusive possession of divine kinship, expressed by his epithet, to the Ugaritic community that he governs.

²⁹ KTU 1.23.52-3. They may be regarded as the hypostases of the god Athtar (Venus), representing the morning and evening stars, respectively: Craigie (1977: 36); Wyatt (2002: 332 n. 47).

³⁰ KTU 1.23.1, 23, 58, 60, and 67. Ug. *n'm*, 'handsome, beneficent, magnanimous, gracious, good': DUL 613-4; cf. 614 (II); Heb. נָעַם: HALOT 706; Ph., Pun. *n'm*: DNWSI 738. Some (Gaster, 1946a: 67-8, 69-72; Wyatt, 2002: 334 n. 53) argue convincingly that the 'Gracious Gods' are identified as 'Shahar and Shalem', whereas others (Virolleaud, 1933: 148; Dussaud, 1933: 12; and Hooke, 1938: 41) say that they are not.

³¹ KTU 1.23.2. Cf. Wyatt (2002: 325).

³² KTU 1.23.22. Ug. *šr*, 'prince, sovereign, as a divine title; Prince, as a royal or heroic title': DUL 842 (III); cf. Heb. שָׂר: HALOT 1350-3; Ph., Aram. *šr*: DNWSI 1190-1; Akk. *šarru*: AHw 1188-90; CAD 17/2[š] 76-112. The two princes are identified as Shahar and Shalem. Differently, Virolleaud (1933: 130) reads [*b*] *n šrm*, 'sons of a prince'. Cf. *bn šp[]* at KTU 1.23.2, which can be read as *bn šp[š]*, 'sons of Shap[sh]'. It has been read also as *bn š[rm(?)]*, 'sons of a prince (?)' by Virolleaud (*ibid.*: 129 and 132); in this case, the prince indicates Shapsh (cf. *špš* in KTU 1.23.25, 54; Wyatt, 2002: 325 and n. 2). It is also used as the second element of the epithet of a deity; probably, El: *mt w šr*, 'Hero and Sovereign' (KTU 1.23.8).

³³ Whilst the Gracious Gods have been assessed as 'a pair of relatively minor deities' (Pardee, 1997: 274-5), they are regarded, more probably, as the ideologically 'royal gods' (Wyatt, 2002: 324-5 and n. 1; and also, cf. Foley, 1980). Thus they refer to the peripheral secondary gods rather than lesser deities.

1.2.1. *ab bn il*

It occurs with a complementary noun in the expression *ab bn il*, 'Father of the Sons of El'³⁴, which conveys distinctively the kinship sense of lesser deities to their 'Father' god. In the ritual texts, a 'theogonic sense' of the *bn il* may be emphasised by the repeated usage in the following expressions: *dr bn il* and *mphrt bn il*³⁵:

yšši l ab bn il May it (sc. a sacrifice) be lifted up³⁶ to the
Father of the Sons of El;

yšši l d[r bn il] may it be lifted up to the Cir[cle of the
Sons of El],

[l] *mphrt bn il* [to] the Assembly of the Sons of El³⁷

(KTU 1.40.41-2³⁸).

De Moor's reading to separate *ab* from *bn il* (sc. "*ab, bn il*")³⁹ is not convincing inasmuch as all phrases which denote the receivers of a sacrifice are prefixed by a preposition *l*, 'to', in the references. The 'isolated' *bn il* could make no contribution to the understanding of the first colon. Thus, the *ab bn il* should be read as a single phrase.

Albright construes the phrase *bn il(m)* as denoting the 'members of the El-group' (sc. 'gods'); hence the term *bn* in the constructed phrase

³⁴ Or, 'Father of divine Sons'.

³⁵ Oldenburg (1969: 18): the phrases of *dr bn il* and *mphrt bn il* identify 'El as the father of the Ugaritic gods'.

³⁶ The Gt. form of the Ug. $\sqrt{nš}^2$, to 'raise, lift': DUL 648-9. Cf. Heb. נָשָׂא: HALOT 724-7; Ph., Aram. $nš^2$: DNWSI 760-3; Ar. *nasa'a*: AEL 2785; Akk. *našû*: AHW 762-5; CAD 11/2[N] 80-112.

³⁷ It is followed in order also by DN: *l tkmn w šnm*, 'to Thunkamun and Shanim'. Cf. KTU 1.65.1-4 and a discussion below.

³⁸ It is paralleled in KTU 1.40.[7-8], [16-7], [24]-5, 33-4 and 1.122.[2-4].

³⁹ De Moor (1970: 197).

expresses, with any following term, 'members of a class or guild', as found in other Semitic terms⁴⁰.

Wyatt also refers to the phrase that 'as a functional use of the term *bn*, it means 'members of the class "god", sc. "divine beings," or collectively "pantheon"'. In addition, he remarks that 'when the mythological aspect is foremost, and it is the filial relation of the gods to El that is at issue, then 'sons of El' is the appropriate meaning'⁴¹. In this respect, the phrase *bn il* may indicate both sides of the 'membership' of the lesser deities in a group of the gods and their 'kinship' with a theogonic sense within the divine group. In other words, these two facts do not conflict with each other, especially in mythological texts.

Parker argues that the phrase *ab bn il* was no longer used as an indication for the fatherhood of El for the *bn il* became an idiomatic expression for the collectivity of the 'gods'; sc. 'divine beings'⁴². However, its denotation of kinship seems to be still addressed effectively as it is seen that the two antithetic meanings (sc. *ab* and *bn*) are juxtaposed intentionally to highlight their kinship. Even if it is so, the primary understanding of the *bn il* becomes its basic sense of kinship at least. Then its usage may be expanded to its secondary sense of membership. Thus, at any rate, the *bn il* explicitly denotes a filial relationship of 'son gods' to El⁴³.

⁴⁰ Albright (1968a: 72). It may be used as a mean of classification, such as Heb. phrases of בני בבל, the 'Babylonians' (Ezek 23.15); בני הנביאים, the 'prophets' (2 Kgs 2.3); or בני אביון, the 'needy' (Ps 72.4), etc. Cf. Avishur (1994: 78). G. Cooke (1964: 24) interprets that it is taken as the meaning of divine beings.

⁴¹ Wyatt (1998a: 43).

⁴² Parker (1999c: 795).

⁴³ Therefore on the basis of KTU 1.23 Cunchillos (1985a: 217-8) adequately concludes that the *bn il* are the gods who constitute a divine family of El, their Father: thus, "Les *bn il* sont des dieux. Ils constituent une famille, *dr bn il*, autour du dieu El, leur Père, *ab bn il*; père, au sens propre, puisqu'il les engendre selon le texte KTU 1.23".

1.2.2. *il bn il*

The kinship of the *bn il* is evident also in the first three lines of a similar ritual text, KTU 1.65: a prayer for the security of the city of Ugarit⁴⁴:

<i>il bn il</i>	El of the Sons of El ⁴⁵ ,
<i>dr bn il</i>	Circle of the Sons of El,
<i>mpḥrt bn il</i>	Assembly of the Sons of El

(KTU 1.65.1-3).

The first line has been construed as constituting a pair of vocatives; thus, *il* and *bn il* are invoked respectively⁴⁶. De Moor's understanding seems plausible in that the first term refers to El for it is written as the headline in the pantheon list; thus, the *il* indicates El as the supreme god of the pantheon⁴⁷. Yet his and other commentators' reading as '*il, bn il*' is not convincing, according to the phrase *ab bn il* at KTU 1.40.41.

Wyatt construes the three phrases as a tricolon made up of vocatives⁴⁸ and translates the first line as 'gods⁴⁹ of the pantheon'⁵⁰. However, the divine list here is paralleled with that of KTU 1.40 and 1.122 above, only with the absence of the preposition *l*. Inasmuch as the *ab* of the *ab bn il* is seen clearly to be modified by the following constructed elements, *bn il*, the *il bn il* here

⁴⁴ KTU 1.65 is widely regarded as a religious prayer to El: Ginsberg (1936a: 88); Eissfeldt (1951: 60-2); and Wyatt (2002: 363). In the meantime, Dietrich-Loretz-Sanmartín (1975) argue that the tablet may have been used for a scribal exercise. Yet KTU 1.40, whose lines 41-2 are comparable to the phrases in lines 1-3 of KTU 1.65, is a ritual text: Parker (1999c: 795). Hence KTU 1.65 is more probably a religious text which has a liturgical context.

⁴⁵ Or, 'El of divine Sons'.

⁴⁶ Ringgren (1947: 74); followed by Aistleitner (1955: 3) and Gray (1966: 182).

⁴⁷ De Moor (1970: 197).

⁴⁸ Wyatt (2002: 363, n. 1). Since they are used for an invocation, he omits definite articles in translation, suggesting: 'O ...'.

⁴⁹ As a construct and plural form: Wyatt (2002: 363, n. 1).

⁵⁰ Wyatt (2002: 363 n. 2) chooses 'pantheon' in place of 'gods' for stylistic reasons; then, the remaining lines run: 'family of the gods; assembly of the gods'. Cf. Wyatt (1998b: 42) interprets that the *il bn il* denotes the 'pantheon as subordinate to El himself, and presumably excluding him'. At any rate he agrees that the 'filial sense is implicit in the term'.

may be recognised as another phraseology of the *ab bn il*, by placing the *il* instead of the *ab*.

The *bn il* here can be understood as an idiomatic usage, as Parker said, but generalised from its primary 'filial' usage, to denote the plural conception of the gods: sc. 'El of divine Sons' or 'El of the pantheon'. Thus, it is realised that the supreme god of the 'pantheon' is invoked first in the prayer. Then the phraseology of the *bn il* occurring in each of the tricolon above emphasises the fact that all the gods in the pantheon are related to El in their kinship.

1.3. *bnt il* 'Daughters of El'

1.3.1. *bnt*

It is stated in a text that there are also female lesser deities in the pantheon:

[bn] <i>bhtk y ilm</i>	(Let not) [the Sons ⁵¹] of your houses, O El;
<i>bnt bh[t]k a[l t]šmh</i>	let no[t] the Daughters of your hous[es] [re]joice ⁵² ;
<i>al tšmh brm [h]kl[k]</i>	let not the Descendents ⁵³ of [your] [pa]lace rejoice!

⁵¹ Whilst it has been read as *bnt* (CTA; KTU¹⁺²; Greenstein, 1977), it is proposed more probably as **bn* (de Moor, 1987: 17) or **bnm* (Dijkstra-de Moor, 1975: 193). Differently, 'Tu as bâti': Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 175), '(In) the building of': Gibson (1978: 53), 'within': del Olmo (1981: 190), or 'in the grandeur of': Pardee (1997: 254, and cf. n. 108). Also cf. Cassuto's own reading (1971: 100-1): [*lt*]brk, 'Thou hast wept'.

⁵² The 3. pl. form of the Ug. $\sqrt{\text{šmh}}$, to 'be glad, rejoice': DUL 825. Cf. Heb. שִׂמְחָה: HALOT 1333-5; Ar. *šamaḥa*: AEL 1595. For the translation as 'Let not ... rejoice', see de Moor (1987: 17); Wyatt (2002: 86).

⁵³ The text is read similarly as *br[m]* (CTA); or *b r*m*[]* (KTU¹); or *b rm[]* (KTU²). If **brm* is taken for a reading (de Moor, 1987: 17; or, possibly either **bnm*: Wyatt, 2002: 86 and n. 69), it may be related adequately to Aram. *br*, 'son, child, descendant' (DNWSI, 188-95).

al aḥdḥm b ymny x[xx]xx Surely⁵⁴ I (sc. Anat) shall seize⁵⁵
 them in my right hand;
b gdlṭ arkty amḥ[š xxx] with the power of my long arm⁵⁶ I
 shall smi[te⁵⁷ (them)!]

(KTU 1.3 v 19-24⁵⁸).

If the supposed reading of *bn* is accepted, the synchronism of each different gender of the gods, *bn* and *bnt*, in the text may indicate the fact that the divine members of the pantheon constitute both males and females, although the generic expression of the 'pantheon' is represented as the masculine indication: sc. *bn il*.

The usage of the *bnt* at this place evidently emphasises the fact that all the gods (male and female) in the pantheon are generated by the supreme god El⁵⁹. Hence they are to be attacked by Anat due to their theogonic relation to El⁶⁰.

⁵⁴ Ug. *al* conveys a positive sense in a volitive statement: DUL 47 (II). Thus, see de Moor (1987: 17); Wyatt (2002: 86).

⁵⁵ Ug. *aḥdḥm*, derived from the $\sqrt{'}hḏ$, to 'collect, take, grasp, seize, and hold': DUL 36-8. Cf. Heb. אָחַז: HALOT 31-2; Akk. *aḥāzu*: AHw 18-20; CAD 1/1[A] 173-8. The present form takes 3. pl. suff. *hm*, which indicates all of the **bn*, *bnt*, and **brm* of El.

⁵⁶ The 'long arm' represents a royal gesture of power attested in ancient Near Eastern iconographies elsewhere. See L'Orange (1953); adopted by Wyatt (1998a). Wyatt (2002: 239 n. 288) lists biblical references for the 'hand of power' motif: Exod 14.16, 26; 17.8-16 (Moses) and Exod 15.6; 32.11; Deut 4.34 (Yahweh). Also see de Moor's references (1987: 17 n. 90): Exod 15.16; Num 11.23; Isa 50.2; 59.1; and Ps 79.11.

⁵⁷ The D form of $\sqrt{'}mḥš$, to 'wound, beat, crush, kill, destroy': DUL 540-1; cf. Heb. מָחָה, to 'smite': HALOT 571.

⁵⁸ The five cola is paralleled in KTU 1.18 i 7-12.

⁵⁹ De Moor (1987: 17 n. 88) proposes that the *bn(m)*, *bnt*, and *brm* (or **bnm*) here are 'not only declared enemies of Ba'lu like Yammu and Motu, but also other members of Ilu's family used to rejoice in the misfortunes of their brother-in-law'. Yet it is doubtful that other secondary gods involved with the throne of the pantheon are included here. When Baal is about to attack Yam's messengers, Anat persuades him not to do so (KTU 1.2 i 40-2), respecting Yam's authority. Moreover, her oath of seeking revenge upon them may signify her overwhelming power and her higher hierarchical rank, if Wyatt's idea on the arm as a

In the text Anat appeals strongly to El with a complaint for the homeless Baal. The vulnerability of the *bn* and *bnt* by another deity indicates the fact that they are identified as lesser deities at a lower level in the pantheon.

1.3.2. *bnt il*

The expression *bnt il*, 'Daughters of El', in KTU 1.23 may be evidence also of El's paternity of the gods. El gives birth to two sons through his two 'daughters'⁶¹, or 'wives'⁶² (sc. 'goddesses'⁶³), who are called Athirat and Rahmay⁶⁴.

Although these *bnt il* may be sorted as the peripheral secondary goddesses, the description in KTU 1.23 may supply, possibly and evidently, the theogonic motif of other lesser 'agent' deities.

1.3.3. *bnt hll*

Although the second element of the phrase has been identified variously, it may be best referred to Enlil/Ellil, known as El in Ugarit, as Gallagher

'royal gesture' is here accepted. Thus, the *brm* may refer, most probably, only to other anonymous lesser deities in El's family.

⁶⁰ Wyatt's interpretation (2002: 86 n. 68) that 'the goddess realises she is being mocked; the lesser deities (El's children') are probably sniggering' is plausible. But Anat's threats 'even' to the lesser deities seem to be the cause not only for the presupposed laughter, but also for El's paternity to them. Since the ultimate object of her appeal or threat is El, she is using here his fatherhood anxiety about his descendants in order to fulfil her purpose.

⁶¹ Cf. KTU 1.23.45-6: *btm bt il bt il w 'lmh*, 'Two daughters are the daughters of El; the daughters of El, and forever'. El is called a father: *hlh tšh ad ad*, 'Lo! She shouted: "Father, Father!"' (KTU 1.23.32; also, 43).

⁶² The goddesses are identified also as El's wives: *a[t]tm att il att il w 'lmh*, 'Two wives are the wives of El; the wives of El, and forever' (KTU 1.23.42; 48-9; also, 39, 43, 46; 52, 60, 64). Two wives call El *mt mt*, 'husband, husband!' (KTU 1.23.40, 46).

⁶³ Cunchillos (1976a: 56-61); Wyatt (2002: 324-5 and n. 1).

⁶⁴ Athirat and Rahmay are regarded as hypostases of Shapsh (KTU 1.23.13) by Wyatt (2002: 327 n. 16).

suggests⁶⁵. This expression, 'Daughters of Ellil', occurs as a companion with another epithet *snnt*, 'Bright Ones'⁶⁶, which may portray their radiant theophany⁶⁷. It may denote also the filial relation of the 'goddesses' (*ilht*⁶⁸) to the supreme god.

The role of the goddesses may be inferred from their epithet *ktrt*, 'Skilful Ones'^{69, 70}. Hence they may be seen as being invoked⁷¹ as divine 'midwives'⁷² to take care of the pregnancy and parturition of Nikkal, and to

⁶⁵ Gallagher (1994: esp. 135-8) plausibly identifies the *hll* with the Sumerian Enlil, equated with the Akkadian god Ellil and the Ugaritic god El (followed by Wyatt, 2002: 337 n. 6), rather than the Canaanite-Arabic god 'Aṭṭar (Wyatt, 1986c: 425) or the Canaanite-Arabic moon god *hll*/Hilālu (Korpel, 1990: 575-6 and n. 363). According to him, the Mesopotamian god Enlil/Ellil was regarded as the most powerful god among the triad (sc. An, Enlil and Enki) of the pantheon in the 3rd and 2nd Millennia B.C.E (Gallagher, *ibid.*: 131); he is attested in Eblaite texts as well as an Akkadian incantation (see Nougayrol, 1969: 397) and some lists of DNs at Ugarit (Nougayrol, 1968: 246-7, also cf. 212); thus, 'It shows that Illil was equated with El, which should come as no surprise given his high stature' (Gallagher, *ibid.*: 135 and n. 31); 'Illil was probably written as *hll* at Ugarit' (Gallagher, *ibid.*: 138; cf. 137: Ebla. 'i' sounds *h*, *h* and *y*). As the deity Hulēl at Emar, see Pardee (1999: 492), accepting Arnaud (1986: 328; 1991: 38).

⁶⁶ Ug. *snnt*; cf. Ar. and Eth. *sny*, to 'shine, gleam': Obermann (1946: 27); thus, 'bright ones': Selms (1954: 86 n. 24); M.S. Smith (1985: 455-6); de Moor (1988: 62, 76 n. 10; 'gleaming ones'); Margalit (1989a: 286 and n. 5; 'radiant ones') and Wyatt (2002: 337; 'Bright Ones'). Cf. as 'brightness, purity'; thus, 'pure ones': Pardee (1989-90: 455-6; 1999). Differently, 'Swallows': Herrmann (1968: 6); de Moor (1987: 231 and n. 49); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 764).

⁶⁷ KTU 1.17 ii 26-7, 31, 33-4, 36, 38, 40; 1.24.6, 15, and 40-2.

⁶⁸ Their divine identity is revealed with this designation at KTU 1.24.11, 40.

⁶⁹ Pardee (1999: 491); Wyatt (2002: 264 and n. 60). As well as its parallelism with the *bnt*, Ug. *ktrt* is construed as a f. pl. form of the *ktr*, which is used as a DN to designate an artificer god: 'Kothar': Wyatt (2002: 264 n. 60). Thus it alludes possibly to the goddesses' function in helping one's procreation: Margalit (1989a: 286).

⁷⁰ KTU 1.17 ii 26, 29-30, 33, 35, 37, 40; 1.24.5-6, 11, 15, 40; and in the pantheon lists: 1.47.[13]; 1.118.12.

⁷¹ The goddesses are called in an invocation form: KTU 1.24.5-6; 11 ('šm'), and 15.

⁷² Pardee (1999: 491) does not agree with a view of them as 'midwives' since they appear before pregnancy. But their function is understood as being initiated from the 'pre-pregnant' period or even from the premarital, as at KTU 1.24 (Wyatt, 2002: 336-7 n. 5). Cf.

give spiritual vitality to her and the unborn child in KTU 1.24, and also in the similar 'childbirth' situation of Danel in KTU 1.17 ii⁷³.

Their function is delineated apparently also in KTU 1.24.48-50 as being responsible for the whole procedure en route from the wedding to childbirth⁷⁴. Thus these goddesses may be classified as 'agent' deities specialised in nuptials and procreation: sc. lesser deities⁷⁵.

The agent deities appear as a plurality (*ʿrb*⁷⁶). Although no clear indication of their number is attested in the texts⁷⁷, it can be supposed possibly as seven for Ug. DN *ktṛt* is paralleled with a plural form of Akk. DN,

Margalit (1989a: 285-6): they are "involved not only in the delivery stage but also – perhaps even primarily – in the earliest phrases of the reproductive process"; and he mentions further: "Their presence in Dan'el's home at the time of insemination and the beginning of pregnancy suggests that they are responsible for bringing the coital act to a successful conclusion in conception".

⁷³ These goddesses are suggested plausibly also as lunar deities in regard to childbirth: Selms (1954: 86 n. 23), agreed by Wyatt (2002: 337 n. 6).

⁷⁴ Thus, cf. Wyatt (2002: 265 n. 66): they are not only 'mid-wives but health-visitors'; thus, they are 'involved in pregnancy and childbirth': (*ibid.*: 340 n. 26).

⁷⁵ With a similar idea Margalit (1989a: 286-7) concludes that they are the 'patron goddesses of newly-wed girls who mythically – and mystically – arrange, bless, and watch over the conjugal bed so as to ensure conception in coitus'; he remarks also that in Danel's home, the goddesses are 'not as midwives but as agents of reproduction'.

⁷⁶ It occurs at KTU 1.17 ii 26 (in *ʿrb b bth ktṛt*, 'had entered his house Skilful Ones') as a 3. f., pl. form of the Ug. $\sqrt{ʿrb}$, to 'enter' (Tropper, 2000: 466) and as the pluperfect tense of its *qatala* form (Husser, 1996: 91-2).

⁷⁷ See KTU 1.24.45-7: *hn b py sprhn b špty mnthn*, 'Lo, in my mouth is their number; on my lips is their amount'. The *-hn* to *spr* and *mnt* is a 3. f., pl. suffix: Wyatt (2002: 341 n. 35). Ug. *mnt* corresponds to Akk. *minītu*, 'amount, number, length, accounting': CAD 10/2[M] 86-7. See Wyatt (2002: 340): 'sum'; also see his (*ibid.*: 340 n. 29 and 341 n. 35) argument against Watson's (1976a: 438) translation as 'Her number ... her counting' and his numbering of the *ktṛt* as two.

^d*sa-sú-ra-tum*⁷⁸, in the pantheon list (RS 20.24.12) and corresponds also to another Akk. DN, ^dNIN.MAḪ⁷⁹, (RS 26.142.16; 1992; and 2004.4)⁸⁰.

1.4. *bn aṭrt* 'Sons of Athirat'

Gods other than El (sc. Yam, Baal, and Athirat, *et al.*) also have their own agent deities. Among them only the lesser deities of the goddess Athirat are called her 'Sons', like 'Sons' of El, which means that they have a filial relation to their mother god.

1.4.1. KTU 1.3 v 36-40⁸¹

<i>yṣh aṭrt w bnh</i>	He (sc. Baal) exclaims ⁸² (to) Athirat
	and her sons,
<i>ilt w ṣbrt aryh</i>	(to) the goddess and the clan ⁸³ of her
	kinsmen ⁸⁴ .

⁷⁸ For its transliteration and interpretation as a plural, see Nougayrol (1968: 50, 63). Also cf. Akk. *ṣassūru*, 'womb, mother goddess': CAD 17/2[Š] 145-6 (cf. seven birth goddesses are suggested). Hence, the number of the *ktrt* is probably seven: de Moor (1987: 145 n. 37).

⁷⁹ Pardee (1999).

⁸⁰ A view of their number as seven is agreed by Wyatt (2002: 340 n. 26 and 29): 'the number seven is also perhaps intrinsically more likely if the goddesses also represent not merely midwives, but protective and benevolent spirits who communicate their personal traits to the new-born, thus transmitting its character'; and he further relates their number plausibly to the biblical reference and the Ugaritic: seven spirits in Isa 11.2 and the seven Baals in KTU 1.47.5-11. Differently, as five, see Margalit (1989a: 285 n. 2).

⁸¹ The parallelism of '*wn ... bnh*' in KTU 1.3 v 38-40 is found in KTU 1.3 iv 47-9; 1.3 v 38-40; 1.4 i 9-13; 1.4 iv 50-2; 1.117.5-6; and cf. 1.8 ii 3-5.

⁸² It is derived from the Ug. *√ṣh*, to 'exclaim, shout, invite, call, claim': DUL 781-2. Cf. Heb. צוּח: HALOT 1011-2; Akk. *ṣiāhu* or *ṣāhu*: AHw 1096; CAD 16[Š] 64-5. Or, less probable, from *√ṣh/wḥ*: Tropper (2000: 645).

⁸³ Ug. *ṣbrt*; 'entity, assembly, community', as a 'social term' rather than 'band, group': Heltzer (1976: 76-7); 'clan, community'; del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 778). Cf. Heb. צְבוּר: HALOT 999.

<i>wn in bt l b⁹l km ilm</i>	'See ⁸⁵ , (there is) no house for Baal
	like (the house of) the gods,
<i>w ḥzr k bn aṭrt</i>	nor the dwelling ⁸⁶ like (the
	dwelling of) the Sons of Athirat;
<i>mṭb il mṣll bnh</i>	(there is) the residence ⁸⁷ (for) El; the
	shelter ⁸⁸ (even for) his sons ⁸⁹ .

Four different designations occur here in parallel to indicate the same lesser deities: *bnh*; *šbrt aryh*; *ilm*⁹⁰; and *bn aṭrt*. The deities appear to be compared ultimately with Baal's homeless situation. A comparison extended to El's

⁸⁴ Ug. *ary*; 'fellow, friend, kin': DUL 111-2. Cf. Akk. *erâ* (*aria*, *irâ*, *iria*), 'side by side': AHw 386; CAD 4[E] 254; and Ar. *ʿara*: AEL 51; Renfroe (1992: 83-4): 'parallel to *aḥ* and *bn*'. Differently, 'parents': Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 348 and n. q).

⁸⁵ Perhaps a constructed form of the *w* and the *hn*, 'see, behold'; thus, see Virolleaud (1938: 70); G.R. Driver (1956: 165); Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 342 n. s); Gibson (1978: 60); and cf. Watson (1994b: 229-32).

⁸⁶ Ug. *ḥzr*; 'dwelling': Wyatt (2002: 87); 'mansion, quarter (measure of length)': DUL 382. It occurs as a divine residence: KTU 1.2 iii 19 (Athtar complains about his own homeless situation); 1.3 iv [47]; 1.3 v 4, 39; and also, 1.4 v 28 (Anat pleads for a dwelling on behalf of Baal); 1.4 i [10]; 1.8 ii 4; 1.117.5 (Baal's complaint about his homeless condition); 1.4 iv 51 (Athirat requests a residence for Baal); and 1.4 v 1 (El gives permission to the construction of a dwelling for Baal); and also cf. KTU 1.114.18 (El's residence) and 1.100.68 (Horon's residence).

⁸⁷ Ug. *mṭb*, 'residence, mansion, chair, seat, hut, shelter', derived from the *√yṭb*, to 'sit down, reside' (DUL 382); DUL 604; cf. 'home': Wyatt (2002: 87). Cf. Heb. מוֹשָׁב: HALOT 561-2; Akk. *mūšabu*: AHw 680; CAD 10/2[M] 250-2.

⁸⁸ Ug. *mṣll*, 'shelter': DUL 608-9. Cf. Akk. *mašallu*, 'shepherd's reed hut or shelter': AHw 619; CAD 10/1[M] 329.

⁸⁹ Rather than as 'the residence of El is the shelter of his sons' (Gibson, 1978: 52; de Moor, 1971: 110; 1987: 15; and cf. Pardee, 1997: 253), which may result in an interpretation of 'all the deities dwelling in El's house'. For the discussion on problems of this translation and for other views, see Wyatt (2002: 83 n. 60): 'it would mean that none of the other second level deities have their own homes, because they all live with their parents'.

⁹⁰ They are identified as the 'gods' by this term.

sons in regard to their residence⁹¹ supports the fact that those collective 'gods' of Athirat have their own residence.

Indeed, lesser deities in the Ugaritic texts are described as having their own place of residence: tents (KTU 1.15 iii 17-19), and also Kothar (-and-Hasis), a peripheral second god, as a tent-dweller:

tb^c ktr l ahlh Kothar left towards his tent;

hyn tb^c l mšknth Hayin⁹² left towards his abode

(KTU 1.17 v 31-32).

Thus Wyatt remarks: 'It is all intended to contrast with the climactic achievement of Baal in gaining his own palace-temple. Therefore his complaint is best interpreted as meaning that all the other deities (down to his own daughter-wives!) have homes'⁹³.

1.4.2. KTU 1.4 vi 44-6

It has been argued that Athirat is the mother god who gave birth to the 'sons' of El⁹⁴. Although she is known as the *qnyt ilm*⁹⁵, 'Mother of the gods'⁹⁶, however, it is not quite clear in the Ugaritic texts whether other numerous gods or their agent deities are also her 'sons'. According to KTU 1.4 vi 46, the

⁹¹ Cf. KTU 1.3 v 39-40; 1.4 i 12-3; and 1.4 iv 52-3.

⁹² Another DN of Kothar (-and-Hasis); cf. Caquot-Szzyrmer (1974: 98); del Olmo (1981: 541); Lipiński (1988: 137-8); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 350).

⁹³ Wyatt (2002: 83 n. 60).

⁹⁴ Cassuto (1971: 54), rendering 'Athirat' to its Hebrew counterpart 'Asherah'; and Cunchillos (1985a: 217-8).

⁹⁵ The phrase occurs six times in KTU 1.4 i 22; 1.4 iii 26, 30, 35; 1.4 iv 32; and 1.8 ii 2.

⁹⁶ Wyatt (2002: 91). The term *qnyt* is derived from the \sqrt{qny} , to 'acquire, create, forge, and procreate': WUS no. 2426; DUL 706; cf. Heb. קנה: HALOT 1111-3; Ph. *qnh*: DNWSI 1015-6; Akk. *qanû*: AHw 898; CAD 13[Q] 91; Ar. *qanā*: AEL 2994; Eth. *qanaya*: Leslau (1987: 437). Cf. 'mistress': Gaster (1950: 164; 1961: 174); G.R. Driver (1956: 93); 'progenitress': Ginsberg (1969: 131); 'creatress': Gordon (1949: 28; 1965: §19.2249); G.R. Driver (1956: 93 n. 2, alternatively); Oldenburg (1969: 18-9).

group of Athirat's sons numbers only seventy; thus, they are called as the *šb^cm bn aṯrt*, 'seventy Sons of Athirat'⁹⁷:

šh aḥh b bhth He (sc. Baal) invited his brothers into his
house;

aryh b qrb hklh (he invited) his kinsmen into the midst of
his palace;

šh šb^cm bn aṯrt he invited seventy Sons of Athirat.

Gaster argues that the 'seventy' indicates only a 'round number indicating multitude'⁹⁸. In fact, the seven may denote the metaphorical number of the septuple celestial structure⁹⁹; hence, Wyatt refers the seventy of the gods to 'an allusion to the designation of the pantheon'¹⁰⁰.

Yet, these interpretations may produce some problems. The first problem which they pose concerns insufficient references in the Ugaritic texts: the 'seventy' is not attested as the abstract quantity of the pantheon elsewhere. Another notable fact that it is not applied to the Sons of El (*bn il*), occurring only in the Sons of Athirat (*bn aṯrt*), poses a question on the theory that the 'seventy' signifies the pantheon and conveys the significance of cosmological origin. Moreover, Baal is portrayed as attacking the *bn aṯrt* at KTU 1.6 v 1.

The key to the problem here lies in the fact that the specific number is only used restrictively for Athirat's lesser deities. Thus it may not support Athirat's maternity of the whole pantheon. But in any case, the filial relation of the lesser deities to Athirat is discerned in the phrase *bn aṯrt*, as in the case of the *bn il*.

⁹⁷ Wyatt (1998b: 46) argues that Ug. *bn* of the phrase is translated better in a sense of 'sons' rather than 'children' here, 'as giving prestige (here to a fecund mother)'.

⁹⁸ Gaster (1946a: 58 and n. 16).

⁹⁹ Wyatt (1987b: 393): the typological number of seven alludes to a 'cosmos conceptualised as seven concentric spheres or cubes'.

¹⁰⁰ Wyatt (1987b: 393).

In the descriptions, the lesser deities of Athirat are invited to come to the newly built palace for Baal after its construction is completed. Here these divine guests are identified as Baal's brothers (*aḥh*) or relatives (*aryh*) inasmuch as they occur in a paralleled construction; hence their kinship to Baal may be suggested. In KTU 1.6 i, the term *ary* is used also to indicate Athirat's sons:

<i>tšmḥ ht</i>	Let her rejoice now ¹⁰¹ ;
<i>aṯrt w bnh</i>	Athirat and her sons,
<i>ilt w šbrt aryh</i>	the goddess and the clan of her kinsmen

(KTU 1.6 i 39-41).

In the text the third line is described additionally to make the second line clear. In this regard, the phrase *šbrt aryh* is related in parallelism with *Ug. bnh*¹⁰².

1.4.3. KTU 1.6 v 1-4

Their identity is articulated more clearly as follows:

<i>yiḥd bʿl bn aṯrt</i>	Baal seized the Sons of Athirat;
<i>rbm ymḥš b ktp</i>	the great ones ¹⁰³ he struck ¹⁰⁴ with a scimitar ¹⁰⁵ ;
<i>dkym ymḥš b šmd</i>	the radiant ones ¹⁰⁶ he struck with a mace ¹⁰⁷ ;

¹⁰¹ Wyatt (2002: 131).

¹⁰² Albright (1932: 197 n. 47) notes correctly that the *ary* has a parallelism with the *aḥh*, 'his brothers': sc. 'Baal's brothers'. See the text of KTU 1.4 vi 44-6 and the exegetical discussion above.

¹⁰³ Ug. *rb*, to 'be great, large': DUL 727-8. Cf. Heb. רב: HALOT 1170-2; Aram. *rb*: DNWSI 1045-51; Akk. *rabû*: AHw 936-40; CAD 14[R] 26-37.

¹⁰⁴ Ug. *mḥš*, to 'wound, beat, crush, kill': DUL 540-1; Wyatt (2002: 140): 'strike'. Cf. Heb. מַחֵשׁ: HALOT 571; Akk. *maḥāšu*: AHw 580-2; CAD 10/1[M] 71-84.

¹⁰⁵ Ug. *ktp*; 'blade': Wyatt (2002: 140 n. 102); 'shoulder, shoulder blade, scimitar': DUL (2004: 469). It is a divine weapon: Watson (1995: 545-6); Vita-Watson (2002: 146-9). Cf. O'Callaghan (1952); Bordreuil-Pardee (1993: 68); and Vita (1996: 442 n. 24).

¹⁰⁶ It refers to Ar. *ḍakīyu*, 'brilliant': Albright (1932: 203 n. 95); 'splendid, noble': G.R. Driver (1956: 154); 'resplendent': Gaster (1961: 224); followed by Wyatt (2002: 140 and n. 103).

šgrm ymšh l arš the small ones¹⁰⁸ he pulled¹⁰⁹ to the earth.

Ginsberg has construed Ug. *rbm* and *dkym* as DNs of each single deity¹¹⁰. Against this view, de Moor interprets them cogently to be paralleled with *bn atrt* as plurals¹¹¹.

Wyatt argues that the three designations *rbm*, *dkym*, and *šgrm* signify a 'ranking of the gods whom Baal kills'; thus, the second term *dkym* is understood as the divine entities ranked as the intermediate level between the *rbm* and the *šgrm*¹¹².

With regard to this, in Wyatt's monograph, Watson suggests that "the meaning of *dkym* may perhaps be found in Akk. *dekû*, 'to mobilize' (see CAD, III [D], 123-28 [124, 126] AHw, 166-7) so that we would have the series 'great ones ... warriors ... small ones'. Although the etymology of the term and its interpretation remain conjectural, as Wyatt notes¹¹³, his idea is notable.

If the supposed etymological root is accepted, it may be taken as a hierarchical designation of rank occurring among the 'agent' deities of

Thus, it may portray the radiant theophany of the lesser deities. Differently, 'pounders of the sea': Dijkstra (1974: 64) and Gibson (1978: 79); or, 'those who were like Yam': del Olmo (1981: 231); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 541). For the discussion on other opinions, see de Moor (1971: 227); Caquot-Szzyr (1974: 265 n. c); and del Olmo (1982: 68-9).

¹⁰⁷ Ug. *šmd*; construed as a divine weapon; thus, 'mace or double-headed axe': de Moor (1971: 135); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 785).

¹⁰⁸ Ug. *šgr*, 'small, young'; cf. Heb. צעיר (צעיר): HALOT 1041; Akk. *šeḫēru*: AHw 1088; CAD 16[Š] 120-4; 179-85. Cf. 'young ones': del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 780). But it is more probable to render it as 'small ones': Bauer (1934: 243), followed by de Moor (1971: 227); de Olmo (1981: 231); Wyatt (2002: 140). It would be perhaps a complementary term to the *rbm* for a balance; thus, 'great (large) ... small': de Moor (*ibid.*).

¹⁰⁹ Ug. *ymšh*, to 'pull'; cf. Ar. *maṣaḥa*: AEL 2718; de Moor (1971: 111); van Zijl (1972: 188, 217, 231); Dietrich-Loretz (1987: 20-1). Differently, 'abattre': Caquot-Szzyr (1974: 265 and n. d); to 'trample, stamp': Margalit (1980: 189-90).

¹¹⁰ Ginsberg (1969: 141).

¹¹¹ De Moor (1971: 227); also Caquot-Szzyr (1974: 265 n. c).

¹¹² Wyatt (2002: 140 n. 103).

¹¹³ Wyatt (2002: 140 n. 103).

Athirat. Thus, the intermediate rank, the *dkym*, may refer to ones with a military character¹¹⁴.

However, Wyatt tends to render the *dkym*, ranked as the second, to the royal figures in KTU 1.1-1.6, such as Yam, Baal, or Mot. If Athirat's sons here denote the second major gods like Yam or even other members of the pantheon, the text should be seen as a description of the climax of the cosmogonic theomachy.

Yet it apparently seems that the *rbm*, *dkym*, and *šgrm* all belong to the *bn atrt*, and they would be distinguished more probably as the 'agent' deities of the goddess rather than as other major secondary gods. Besides, textual evidence alludes to the fact that another theomachy has been caused by Anat as well as by Baal (KTU 1.4 ii 21-6).

1.4.4. KTU 1.4 ii 21-6

<i>ik mgy aliyn b'ł</i>	Why ¹¹⁵ has Mightiest Baal come ¹¹⁶ ?
<i>ik mgyt b[t]lt 'nt</i>	Why has V[ir]gin Anat come?
<i>mḥsy hm [m]ḥs bny</i>	Will my (sc. Athirat's) smiters ¹¹⁷ , [s]mite my sons? ¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Wyatt (2002: 140 n. 103): 'As we have members of the pantheon, perhaps denoting three ranks of gods in descending order, this would perhaps indicate that the second rank is military in character'.

¹¹⁵ Ug. *ik* is here construed more properly as an interrogative 'why' (Obermann, 1948: 90; Gordon, 1949: 29; Aistleitner, 1964: 38; Ginsberg, 1969: 132; Wyatt, 2002: 94), rather than as 'how' (G.R. Driver, 1956: 93; Jirku, 1962: 40; Caquot-Szzyr, 1974: 198-9; Gibson, 1978: 57; Pardee, 1997: 257; del Olmo-Sanmartín, 2004: 42, 533). Thus it portrays Athirat's own anxiety, which may be related to the events in KTU 1.6 v 1-4; vi 10-11 and 14-5; cf. Wyatt (1998b: 43). One of the possible reasons for the allied forces of Baal-Anat against Athirat's sons may be found in their complaints of the residence; whilst Baal had no house, lesser deities had their own residences and Anat helped Baal by her appeal. For the objection on its translation as a negation 'not' (Goetze, 1953: 120-1), see van Zijl (1972: 83).

¹¹⁶ 'Has ... come' (Gordon, 1949: 29; G.R. Driver, 1956: 93; Wyatt, 2002: 94). Cf. 'is ... coming' (van Zijl, 1972: 83; Clear, 1976: 9; de Moor, 1987: 48).

hm [mkly š]brt ary y Will they [destroy ¹¹⁹ the c]lan of my
kinsmen?

Here it is hardly possible to judge that the *bn atrt* may indicate the pantheon since the Ugaritic tablet does not provide any clarity about this issue due to its damaged state. Hence it is best understood as divine warfare between Baal-Anat and Athirat's own lesser deities.

Thus the three designations in KTU 1.6 v 1-4 probably denote the rank of Athirat's agent deities, who are killed by Baal in divine battle. This warfare may be related further to the event described in KTU 1.6 vi 10-11 and 14-5¹²⁰. The weight of this circumstantial evidence leads to the conclusion that the seventy deities indicate Athirat's own lesser deities who are generated from the goddess herself.

¹¹⁷ Gordon (1949: 29): 'my smiters'. The verbal root *mḥs* basically denotes to 'wound, beat, crush, or kill': DUL 540-1. Ug. *mḥsy* has been interpreted as a noun plus a 1. sg. pron. suf.: thus, 'my assassins' (del Olmo, 1981: 196; del Olmo-Sanmartín, 2004: 341, 541); or 'my enemies' (Caquot-Szzyr, 1974: 199; Gibson, 1978: 57; Wyatt, 2002: 94). Differently, 'to slay me' (de Moor, 1971: 41; 1987: 48; Clear, 1976: 9); 'Would you murder me' (M.S. Smith, 1997: 123); and 'those who would smite me' (Pardee, 1997: 257). Cf. Obermann (1948: 90): 'a smiter'.

¹¹⁸ Ug. *hm* has been taken as a 3. du. pron.; thus, read as a declarative clause: 'they are my assassins (...), they are (the destroyers) of the clan of my kin': del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 341, 541). But it may be juxtaposed, more probably, as an interrogative after the preceding interrogative clauses: thus, *ik ... ik; hm ... hm*. Cf. de Moor (1971: 41); M.S. Smith (1997: 123); and Wyatt (2002: 94).

¹¹⁹ It may be taken here as the D. act. ptc. form of the *√kly*, to 'finish, empty, consume, and destroy': del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 441-2).

¹²⁰ In the story it alludes to how Baal might take seven (maybe dead) agent deities of Athirat from the divine warfare and give them to Mot for his meal.

1.5. *bn qdš* 'Sons of the Holy One'

Whilst the same meaning is to be discerned also in the *bn qdš*, 'Sons of the Holy One'¹²¹, the second element of the phrase presents an issue as to whether it refers to the epithet of the supreme god El or to that of another god.

1.5.1. KTU 1.16 i 9-11¹²²

<i>ap krt bnm il</i>	Then (is) Keret the son of El?;
<i>šph ltpn w qdš</i>	(is Keret) the offspring ¹²³ of the Wise and
	Holy One ¹²⁴ ?

It has been argued that the last term *qdš* in the text is the epithet of a goddess¹²⁵. However, it is regarded more convincingly as the second element of El's double epithet¹²⁶ inasmuch as the epithet of King Keret, *šph ltpn w qdš*¹²⁷, is paralleled with the *bnm il* in the previous line; thus, *šph* || *bnm* and

¹²¹ KTU 1.2 i 21, 38; 1.2 iii [19-20], 1.17 i 3, 8, 10-11, 13, 22; and 1.94.25. Del Olmo (1981: 170) and M.S. Smith (1994: 266) render the *bn qdš* to the 'holy ones'; hence, *bn* as a pl. construct plus *qdš* as a genitive form. However, as Wyatt (2002: 54 n. 78) points out, the 'Sons of the Holy One' is more appropriate for its translation in a mythological context, like the *bn il*, 'Sons of El'.

¹²² It is paralleled with KTU 1.16 i 20-2 and 1.16 ii 48-9.

¹²³ Ug. *šph*; 'family, offspring, descendants, and clan': DUL 835. Cf. Ph., Pun. *šph*: DNWSI 1181; Heb. משפחה: HALOT 651.

¹²⁴ Wyatt (2002: 221). The phrase indicates the fact that El's name is combined with one of his epithets; cf. Pope (1955: 44, 55).

¹²⁵ Thus, 'Asherah' (sc. Athirat): Ginsberg (1946: 44); a 'sacred being': Gaster (1947a: 289); 'Athirat': de Moor (1970: 203); WUS no. 2394; and a goddess 'Qudshu': Binger (1997: 56-60).

¹²⁶ Wiggins (1991: 389); Wyatt (1998b: 44; 2002: 221 n. 203 and 54 n. 78).

¹²⁷ The *šph ltpn w qdš* is an ideological title for the mortal ruler with his other epithet *bn il*. These titles may have been used for a political or ideological propaganda that the king is a legal son who has received an authentic ruling authority from the supreme god. At any rate, the *bn il* provides a filial sense to the god.

ltpn w qdš || *il* are juxtaposed¹²⁸. Thus, in this regard, the *qdš* of the *bn qdš* refers to El and the whole phrase *bn qdš* denotes the theogonic relation of lesser deities to the supreme god.

1.5.2. KTU 1.2 i 19-21

In fact, lesser deities entitled as *bn qdš* occur only in a setting with which El is closely connected, as in the context of a banquet below:

<i>tb^c ḡlmm l ytb</i>	The Lads ¹²⁹ departed ¹³⁰ ; they did not ¹³¹ sit down ¹³² .
<i>i[dk pnm] l ytn</i>	T[hen (their) faces] certainly ¹³³ they set
<i>tk ḡr ll</i>	towards the divine ¹³⁴ mountain,
<i>ḡm phr m^cd</i>	towards the assembly of the council.

¹²⁸ Moreover, a combined divine male-female epithet is an unusual form and it is not attested in any other place in the Ugaritic texts: Margalit (1989b: 377 n. 11). Ug. *qdšt* may be adopted better to designate a goddess: Wiggins (1991: 389); he also remarks that a mortal is never mentioned as a son of the goddess in the Ugaritic texts elsewhere, whereas lesser deities are called sons (*bn aṛrt*; cf. discussion above); thus, it is hardly seen that Athirat occurs here as the divine mother of Keret.

¹²⁹ Discussion of Ug. *ḡlm* will be made in Chapter III.

¹³⁰ It is taken as a G. 3. m. du. form (Troppner, 2000: 468) of the Ug. *√tb^c*, to 'leave, depart': Huehnergard (1987: 184); DUL 857-8. Cf. Ar. *tabi^ca*: AEL 293-5; Syr. *tba^c*: Brockelmann (1966: 814); and Akk. *tebū*: AHW 1342-3. Its dual form indicates evidently that the messenger gods were in pairs. For more discussion on the number of dispatched messengers, see Chapter III.

¹³¹ The negative force of the expression is addressed quite emphatically. It may indicate a quick response of the lesser gods to an order given from their master god.

¹³² Ug. *y^ctb*, to 'sit down, take a seat on the throne, install oneself, reside': DUL 994-5. Cf. Heb. יָשַׁב: HALOT 444-5; Ph., Pun. *yšb*: DNWSI 473-5; Syr. *yiteb*: Brockelmann (1966: 311-2); and Akk. *wašābu*: AHW 1480-4; CAD 1/2[A] 386-408. For other possible translations, 'delay': Wyatt (2002: 60). This term may suggest that the agent gods were supposed to sit down in front of their master god before conducting their task given by him.

¹³³ Ug. *l* can be construed in two opposed senses: either as negative '(do) not ...' or asseverative '(do) certainly': Gordon (1965: §9.19); Dahood (1965: 22-3). It is used here in the latter sense since we expect them to be obedient to the mission charged by their master god.

¹³⁴ The text should be read as *il* rather than *ll*: cf. del Olmo (1981: 572); M.S. Smith (1986); and Wyatt (1995c: 135-6; 1996: 44; 2002: 58 n. 101).

<i>ap ilm lh[m] ytb</i>	Then gods sat down to ea[t],
<i>bn qdš l trm</i>	the Sons of the Holy One (sat down) to
	feed themselves ¹³⁵ .

The *bn qdš* is identified as the *ilm*, 'gods'¹³⁶, through its paralleled construction. At this scene the anonymous lesser 'gods' appear as son-gods of the supreme god. In the Ugaritic texts there is little to determine the attribute of lesser deities. Ug. *ilm* employed here as a general term is one of them, which inform their attribute as 'gods'¹³⁷.

The notion that the lesser deities are holy (*qdš*) may be derived from the acknowledgement that El is holy. The ancient Ugaritians might have evaluated the abstract quality of the gods to be holy from their understanding of divine genetics. Thus, the son-gods may be determined as holy gods, following their father-god's attribute, recognised from his epithet *qdš*. They are privileged also to attend the supper hosted by El as its members. Thus, the phrase *bn qdš* may also indicate the lesser gods' membership of the pantheon.

Summary

Several Ugaritic terms indicate the kinship relation of lesser deities to their master god(dess): *bn il(m)*; *bnt il*; *bn aṭrt*; *bn qdš*; and *bn aṭrt*, etc. These Ugaritic expressions imply the Ugaritic theogony. The Ugaritic texts state

¹³⁵ Ug. *trm*, to 'eat, feed oneself': DUL 931. Cf. Akk. *šarāmu*: AHw 1184-5; CAD 17/2[Š] 48-9; Ar. *tarima*: AEL 335.

¹³⁶ KTU 1.2 i 20, 37; 1.2 iii 19; and it occurs, paralleled with the *bn qdš*, also to describe the lesser deities who are served in the temple by Danel in KTU 1.17 i 2, 6-[7], 9-[10], 12 and 21. They act as divine mediators between Danel and Baal: for further discussion, cf. 'Mediator Deities in the Ugaritic Texts' in Chapter V.

¹³⁷ The lesser deities entitled as the *bn qdš*, 'Sons of the Holy One', are identified as the *ilm*, 'gods' as at KTU 1.2 i 19-21, etc.; also, the *bn aṭrt*, 'Sons of Athirat', refers to the *ilm*, 'gods' in KTU 1.3 v 38-9, etc. Gupan and Ugar, the messenger deities, are called also the *ilm* in KTU 1.3 iii 32; 1.5 i 9, etc.

that the supreme god El appears as the father god of the lesser deities; hence he is called *h̄tk*, *ab bn il*, *il bn il*, *ab šnm*, *bnt il*, or *bn qdš*, etc. Thus, it is concluded that lesser deities have a filial relation to El as his son gods. It is informed also that the goddess Athirat has her own son gods: *bn atrt* (KTU 1.3 v 36-40; 1.4 vi 44-6; 1.6 v 1-4; and cf. 1.4 ii 21-6).

2. The Outward Appearance of Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts

In regard to the argument of the kinship relation of lesser deities to the supreme god, the examination of their 'horned' or 'winged' appearance is crucial. In this respect, iconographical comparison will be employed for the deliberation.

One of El's epithets is *tr il*¹³⁸, 'Bull¹³⁹ El', which provides a possible image of his 'horned' appearance. Its usage, extended to *tr il abk*¹⁴⁰ ('Bull El, your Father'), *tr il abh*¹⁴¹ ('Bull El, his Father'), or *tr il aby*¹⁴² ('Bull El, my Father'), etc., indicates El as the progenitor of other gods of the pantheon¹⁴³.

According to the epithets of the father god, lesser gods may be suggested to be in horned form. In fact, they are regarded as 'creatures' of the 'Creator' god¹⁴⁴ as well as 'sons'¹⁴⁵ of their 'Father' god. The ancient

¹³⁸ The phrase occurs in KTU 1.1 v [10], 22; 1.4 ii 10; 1.4 iii 31; and 1.4 iv 1.

¹³⁹ Ug. *tr*; 'bull': DUL 930. Cf. Heb. שׁוֹר: HALOT 1451-3; Akk. *šūru*: AHw 1287; CAD 17/3[Š] 369. This animal term is used, with the *zby*, also for military ranks of mortal soldiers: *šh šb'm try tnmym zbyy*, 'call my seventy Bulls, my eighty Gazelles' (KTU 1.15 iv 6-7). For animal terms used as designations in the Ugaritic texts, cf. Miller (1970b: 178-80).

¹⁴⁰ KTU 1.1 ii [18]; 1.2 iii 16-7; and 1.6 iv 10. Cf. *tr abk il*: KTU 1.14 ii 23-4; *tr il ab*: KTU 1.1 iii [5]; or *tr ab il*: KTU 1.2 i 16.

¹⁴¹ KTU 1.1 iii 26; 1.2 iii 21; 1.3 v 10, 35; 1.4 i 4-[5]; and 1.4 iv 47. Cf. *tr abh il*: KTU 1.2 i 33, 36; 1.14 ii 6; and 1.92.15; or, *tr abh*: KTU 1.14 i 41.

¹⁴² KTU 1.2 iii 19; 1.3 iv 54; and 1.17 i 23.

¹⁴³ Oldenburg (1969: 18).

¹⁴⁴ Ug. *bn̄y bnwt*. Another epithet of El, meaning 'Creator of creatures'; lit., 'Builder of the built (pass. ptc.):' KTU 1.4 ii 11; 1.4 iii 32; 1.6 iii 5, 11; and 1.17 i 24. Pope (1955: 49)

Ugaritians may have associated the appearance of lesser deities with the Creator god's or Father god's image. Thus, it may be suggested that if El has a horned image like a bull, his lesser deities then may be horned like their father god. In some cases this can be inferred from the texts, although it is somewhat conjectural.

2.1. KTU 1.2 i 11-3

The theriomorphic appearance of lesser deities occurs:

<i>mlakm ylak ym</i>	Messengers ¹⁴⁶ Yam sent,
[t'dt tpt nhr]	[the embassy ¹⁴⁷ of Judge ¹⁴⁸ Nahar.] ¹⁴⁹

acknowledged El's paternity of gods and humans; but on the other hand, he denied El's creativity: "It is altogether probable that El was a Creator God, but the Ugaritic evidence is by no means explicit. All the Ugaritic allusions to El's creativity are in terms of generation and paternity". However, as de Moor (1980a: 172) pointed out, there seems to be no difference between the two terms, 'generation' and 'creativity'. In a 8th century B.C.E. inscription at Karatepe, a site of a Late Hittite fortress city in south-central Turkey, and in a neo-Punic inscription at Leptis Magna (and elsewhere, such as at Palmyra), the phrase *qn 'rš*, 'Creator of the earth', refers to El (Pope, 1955: 25, 52-4; and cf. de Moor's bibliography, 1980a 171 n. 3, on this view) although the expression is not attested in Ugaritic. Others are also convinced of the creativity of El: Gray (1965: 33); Oldenburg (1969: 16f.); and Caquot-Szzyner (1974: 57). Heb. בנה (lit., to 'build') has the same *Sitz im Leben* as Ug. *bny*; it is used in the sense of 'creation' (of Eve) in Gen 2:22; as Pope (1955: 50) also viewed. El is introduced also as the *qny*, 'Creator' or 'Procreator' (KTU 1.3 v 9; 1.10 iii 5). Cf. de Moor (1980a).

¹⁴⁵ Ug. *bn* may be related to the verbal root *bny*, to 'build': DUL 233-4. Cf. Heb. בנה: HALOT 139; Ph., Pun., Aram. *bny*: DNWSI 175; and Akk. *banû*: AHw 103; CAD 2[B] 83-90; and also, cf. 94-5: Akk. *bānû*, 'creator, begetter'. Thus, cf. Pope (1955: 50).

¹⁴⁶ Ug. *mlak* may be stressed at the head of the colon: M.S. Smith (1994: 282). The term shall be discussed in 'Ugaritic Titles of Messenger Deities' in Chapter III.

¹⁴⁷ Ug. *t'dt* shall be discussed in 'Ugaritic Titles of Messenger Deities' in Chapter III.

¹⁴⁸ Ug. *tpt*, to 'judge': DUL 926. Cf. Heb. שפט: HALOT 1622-6; Pun., Aram. *špt*: DNWSI 1181-2; and Akk. *šapāṭu*: AHw 1172; CAD 17[Š/1] 450. It occurs here as a divine epithet.

¹⁴⁹ The restoration is suggested on the basis of KTU 1.2 i 22, 26, 28, 30, 41 and 44. Cf. a different reading of 't'dt ylak tpt nhr': KTU² 6 n. 4. Cf. Caquot-Szzyner (1974: 128): 'le Juge Nahar envoie une ambassade'.

divine messengers, interpreting it as “the bills of their beaks (open) to a span”¹⁵⁶.

The context of the other texts informs us that the messengers do not depart yet; they are still staying to receive instructions from the sender. Smith understands the *uṭ tbr aḫm* as ‘some physical gesture (e.g., snorting) which is idiomatic for joy’; thus, ‘messengers rejoice at the prospect of receiving instructions from their master Yamm and then they receive these instructions in the following lines’¹⁵⁷.

Wyatt renders it as ‘their nostrils flaring’, doubting their departure before receiving instructions from their sender; he suggests that ‘perhaps, eager to be off, they are flying up and down before their instructions are given’¹⁵⁸.

In the Ugaritic texts elsewhere, in fact, they are pictured apparently as a winged form¹⁵⁹. However, the phrase *uṭ tbr aḫm* seems to illustrate their image of breathing from their nose¹⁶⁰ like raging bulls, rather than like birds. As a result, it can be interpreted that the agent deities are exceedingly ready to fly up before receiving the instructions.

Therefore, their appearance may be suggested as a theriomorphic form, taken from both an avian image¹⁶¹ and a bull. Although the messengers are Yam’s lesser deities, the conclusion abstracted from the discussion may

¹⁵⁶ De Moor (1987: 31 and n. 134).

¹⁵⁷ M.S. Smith (1994: 284).

¹⁵⁸ Wyatt (2002: 57 n. 97).

¹⁵⁹ De Moor (1987: 31 n. 133) rightly comments on the *npr šm[m]* in line 12 that ‘The messengers took the form of birds’. The travelling of divine messengers over a long distance may allude to their flying function.

¹⁶⁰ Hence, as ‘breathing satisfaction’: del Olmo (1981: 169, 524).

¹⁶¹ For the deities in avian form, cf. Korpel (1996), although the present text is not included in the discussion. Wyatt (2002: 57-8 n. 98) pictures an anthropomorphic form (cf. KTU 1.2 i 41-2) combined with an avian form.

apply to the shape of other agent deities as well: Gupan and Ugar, divine messengers of Baal, have been postulated as being winged¹⁶².

In addition, the flying function may be recognised among the second gods (KTU 1.4 ii 12-6; 21-4; thus, Baal and Anat). In iconographies of Baal, he is shown sometimes as horned¹⁶³ (cf. KTU 1.101.6) or winged¹⁶⁴ (cf. KTU 1.46.6¹⁶⁵). In KTU 1.18 Anat herself is about to hover among a flock of falcons and hawks over Aqhat (cf. iv 21 f.). In any event, Anat appears as flying¹⁶⁶; thus, she may be discerned as being in a winged form¹⁶⁷ and also as being horned¹⁶⁸.

¹⁶² Cf. Fensham (1966: 164). The discussion on Gupan and Ugar shall be made in Chapter III.

¹⁶³ Baal is imagined as both anthropomorphic and bovine in KTU 1.5 v 17-21; (probably) 1.9.11; 1.10 iii; and 13.21-36. In the cylinder seals of R.S. 21.020 (in Schaeffer-Forrer, 1983: 47) and R.S. 28.025 (*ibid.*: 54) and in a Ras-Shamra hematite (see a picture of Appendice 2 in *ibid.*: 69), Baal is represented as seizing a weapon in his one hand and as being groomed with decorated horns: 'le cylindre figure le dieu Baal coiffé d'une calotte à large bord relevé, peut-être ornée de cornes'. Also at R.S. 24.358 (*ibid.*: 52), he is depicted with two horns, whose images are found with this god in Ugaritic monuments elsewhere: 'Baal, caractérisé par deux cornes émergeant de son front qui rappellent le casque avec cornes porté par ce dieu sur plusieurs monuments d'Ugarit'. He is expressed well on the stele preserved in the Louvre Museum (AO 15775) as standing upright, groomed with a helmet provided with two lateral horns (cf. Schaeffer, 1933: 122-4 and pl. XVI; 1949: 121-30 and pl. XXIV; Yon, 1991: 294-9 and no. 15; 1997: 144 and no. 18; also cf. Cornelius, 1994: 135-8). Cf. a fig 13 (3) in Schaeffer, 1949a: 40; and also cf. a horned Baal in cylinders from Enkomi (known also as Alasiya; see Enkomi-Alasiya 13.093, Schaeffer-Forrer, *ibid.*: 57) and from Cyprus (Chypre A9, *ibid.*: 62).

¹⁶⁴ The iconographical tradition had continued in the Phoenician period: Baal was depicted with four wings: O. Keel (1977: 194-207, esp. 203).

¹⁶⁵ The text reads *bʿl knp*, (for) 'Baal of a wing'; thus, 'winged' Baal (del Olmo-Sanmartín, 2004: 450).

¹⁶⁶ The clearest evidence is described in KTU 1.10 ii 10-11: *tšū knp btl̄t ʿnt tšū knp wtr bʿp*, 'lifted (her) wing Virgin Anat; she lifted (her) wing and travelled in flight'; also, cf. KTU 1.108.8-9. Ug. *tr* is construed, preferably, as an inf. (Lloyd, 1994: 260 n. 2; followed by Wyatt, 2002: 156 n. 5) of the Ug. *√tr*, to 'scour, travel through' (DUL 875-6). Cf. Heb. חָרַר: HALOT 1707--9; Akk. *tāru*: AHw 1332-6.

¹⁶⁷ In some Ugaritic cylinder seals, Anat is figured as winged: at the cylinder num. R.S. 5.089 (in Schaeffer-Forrer, 1983: 16-21) convincingly refers the winged goddess to Anat;

2.2. KTU 1.12 i 28-32

In the theogonic context of KTU 1.12, El is called *abn*, 'our father' (KTU 1.12 i 9) by two daughter deities of his own (*tlš amt yrh*, 'Talish Maidservant'¹⁶⁹ of Yarih', and *dmgy amt atrt*, 'Dimgay Maidservant of Athirat': KTU 1.12 i 14-7) and he wishes his offspring to have horns. Thus the texts run:

ilm ypʿr šmthm El proclaimed¹⁷⁰ their names.
bhm qrnū km trm 'On them (may there be) horns¹⁷¹ like bulls,
w gbtt km ibrm and humps¹⁷² like steers¹⁷³!

The names of the progeny are known as the *aklm*¹⁷⁴, 'eaters'¹⁷⁵, and the *ʿqqm*¹⁷⁶, 'devourers'^{177/178}. Their bovine traits provide evidently a clue to the theogonic

hence, 'Il me semble que notre cylindre figure précisément Anat pourvue d'ailes et tenant sous sa protection le jeune taureau né dans les roseaux d'Ah-Smak' (*ibid.*: 16).

¹⁶⁸ In KTU 1.10 ii 21-2, she is portrayed as having her own horns: *qrn dbatk blt ʿnt qrn dbatk bʿl ymšh*, 'your strong horns, Virgin Anat; your strong horns let Baal anoint' (cf. Wyatt, 2002: 157). See R.S. 5.089, with a horned helmet, (in Schaeffer-Forrer, 1983: 16-7).

¹⁶⁹ Ug. *amt*; '(female) servant, maidservant': DUL 74. Cf. Heb. אַמָּה: HALOT 61; Ph., Pun. ʿmt; Aram. ʿmt: DNWSI 70-1; Akk. *amtū*: AHw 45; CAD 1/2[A] 80-5.

¹⁷⁰ Ug. *ypʿr* denotes basically 'open (one's mouth) wide'; hence, to 'shout, proclaim': DUL 660-1. Cf. Heb. פָּעַר: HALOT 953; Syr. *pʿr*: Brockelmann (1966: 586).

¹⁷¹ Ug. *qrn*, 'horn': DUL 710-1; Watson (2000: 571). Cf. Heb. קֶרֶן: HALOT 1144-6; Akk. *qarnu*: AHw 904; CAD 13[Q] 134-40.

¹⁷² The f. form of Ug. *gbt*, a 'fleshly part of the back, hump': G.R. Driver (1956: 146); UT §19.555; WUS no. 626; Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 341); and DUL 293-4. Cf. Akk. *gapšūtu*, *gipšu*, *gipšutu*: AHw 281, 290-1; CAD 5[G] 84-5. Differently, 'Körperfülle': Sanmartín (1978: 349 and n. 2).

¹⁷³ Ug. *ibr*; thus, 'junger Stier': WUS no. 34; 'bull, [humped] buffalo': Gordon (1965: §19.39); followed by Huehnergard (1987: 269 and n. 11); 'buffle, taurillon': Caquot-Szyncer-Herdner (1974: 586); 'bull, Zuchtstier': Sanmartín (1978: 349-50); a 'stocky male animal: bull, horse': del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 10-11); and 'steer' (Wyatt, 2002: 163). Cf. Heb. אָבִיר, to 'be strong, powerful': HALOT 6; Akk. *ab(ā)ru*: AHw 7; CAD 1/1[A] 38. The expression *km trm ... km ibrm* is a simile: Wyatt (2002: 163 n. 9).

¹⁷⁴ KTU 1.12 i 26, 36; and 1.12 ii 35.

¹⁷⁵ Ug. ʿkl, to 'eat, devour, consume, make use of, use': DUL 43. Cf. Heb. אָכַל: HALOT 46-7; Ph. and Aram. ʿkl: DNWSI 51-2; and Akk. *akālu*: AHw 26-7; CAD 1/1[A] 245-59.

¹⁷⁶ KTU 1.12 i 27 and 37.

relationship of the lesser deities to their 'horned' father god. In this regard, the *trm* may denote El himself here¹⁷⁹ as Ug. *tr* occurs as an epithet of El¹⁸⁰.

Summary

The outward appearance of Ugaritic lesser deities is suggested, in the Ugaritic texts, to be horned on the basis of the epithet of El (*tr il*, 'Bull El') for they are the sons of their father god El. Their appearance is also referred to as being winged (KTU 1.2 i 11-3). These theriomorphic forms of lesser deities bear the kinship relation of lesser deities to the supreme god. The flying function of the second gods is found in the Ugaritic texts (KTU 1.4 ii 12-6; 21-4: sc. Baal and Anat). Baal is depicted as horned (KTU 1.101.6) or winged (KTU 1.46.6). Anat appears also as flying (KTU 1.10 ii 10-11) and as being horned (KTU 1.10 ii 21-2). In the theogonic text of KTU 1.12 i 28-32, El desires his progenies to have horns. These indications conclude that the lesser deities have a filial relation to El.

¹⁷⁷ Ug. *ʿqqm* occurs as a paralleled DN to Ug. *aklm*; thus, Wyatt (2002: 63-4): 'devourers'. Cf. del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 177): 'destructive (one)', from the $\sqrt{ʿqq}$, relating to Ar. *ʿaqqa* (AEL 2095-7).

¹⁷⁸ Their 'caprid traits' are construed interestingly as 'goats' (sc. the 'prototypes of the sacrificial goats'): Wyatt (1996: 239). But this interpretation may have a genetic problem: does the bull god El give birth to the goats? Other variant suggestions such as 'locusts' (Kapelrud, 1969) or 'flies' (de Moor, 1981-2: 113-4) are rejected correctly by Wyatt (2002: 163 n. 9) for their bovine characteristics are not matched to insects.

¹⁷⁹ This idea, suggested by Wyatt through private communication, supports convincingly the 'kinship' conception of lesser deities with El in their appearance; then, *-m* on *tr* is understood as an enclitic. Although its paralleled term *ibrm* is not attested in the Ugaritic texts for its usage as El's epithet, it seems a plausible scenario. In any case, the *trm* is related evidently to the horned image of lesser deities.

¹⁸⁰ Yahweh is described also as horned: Deut 33.17.

Conclusion to Chapter II, Part I

In the Ugaritic texts the titles of lesser deities indicate that all lesser gods were generated by some higher or older gods, who are called 'father' or 'mother'. As their progenies, their appearances are depicted as horned and winged. From these facts, it is explicit that the agent deities are related closely to their generator gods as a divine family.

These sons of gods have their own positions in the divine council and they are involved in the divine conflicts in regard to the divine kingship, taking 'agent' roles.

PART II. Kinship Relation of Lesser Deities to Their Master God in the Hebrew Bible

In the Hebrew Bible it is not difficult to find explicit references to Yahweh's lesser deities called his 'sons'. Hence some statements confirm the kinship of divine beings through the designation 'sons'. In this part some 'kinship' terms in the biblical Hebrew texts will be examined. In addition, their outward appearance will be investigated as well in the Hebrew Bible.

1. The Kinship Terms for Lesser Deities in the Hebrew Bible

Since some Hebrew terms indicate the kinship relation of lesser deities to their supreme god, it is necessary to investigate these terms that occur in the Hebrew Bible.

1.1. בני אלהים (ה) or בני אלם 'Sons of God'

Although it can be a problematic argument whether these expressions denote a genealogical relationship or a generic title¹⁸¹ of lesser deities, it is apparently analogous to the Ugaritic title *bn il(m)*¹⁸², which plays an important role in the Ugaritic mythology and which indicates a filial relationship between lesser deities and their master god¹⁸³.

¹⁸¹ The בני אלהים (ה) might be construed as a designation of classification, as seen in בני בבל, the 'Babylonians' (Ezek 23.15); בני הנביאים, the 'prophets' (2 Kgs 2.3); or בני אביון, the 'needy' (Ps 72.4), etc.: Albright (1968a: 72); Newsom (1992: 248); Avishur (1994: 78). However, it is understood possibly as a mythological expression in the context: G. Cooke (1964: 24). Cf. Jastrow (1898: 109): such terms as 'son' and 'daughter' in the mythological context are 'employed in all Semitic languages in a figurative sense, to indicate a dependent position of some sort'. Thus it may contain both connotations of the 'membership' of deities in a divine group and their 'kinship' with their master god.

¹⁸² Cf. Herrmann (1960).

¹⁸³ Albright (1957: 261-2) remarks that the בני אלהים (ה), "employed for the angels", has "borrowed" from Ugaritic expression. But he interprets that they are 'poetically called'

1.1.1. Genesis 6.2, 4

The ambiguous¹⁸⁴ expression of בני (ה)אלהים appears in Gen 6.2 and 4¹⁸⁵:

v. 2

ויראו בני האלהים את בנות האדם

כי טבת הנה ויקחו להם נשים מכל אשר בחרו

Then the sons of God¹⁸⁶ saw the daughters of Adam; for fair¹⁸⁷ (were) they, so they took for themselves wives from all that they chose.

v. 4a

הנפילים היו בארץ בימים ההם וגם אחרי כן

The Nephilim¹⁸⁸ were on the earth in those days; and also after that;

v. 4b

אשר יבאו בני האלהים אל בנות האדם וילדו להם

Yahweh's 'children', as his creatures, with the Israelites. However, if it has been "borrowed" from Ugaritic, it might have been used, at least during the earliest period of the transformation of the expression, for its original meaning with a theogonic sense. Its literal meaning as the 'kinship' term (sc. 'sons of God') might have been diminished in its usage under the construction of biblical theology of "monotheism".

¹⁸⁴ The interpretation of the term has been one of the textual cruxes in the Old Testament studies: cf. Coleran (1941: 488); Newman (1984). Thus, diverse interpretations have been made of the phrase: cf. Eslinger (1979: 65).

¹⁸⁵ For the general discussion on the texts, see, representatively, Cloisen (1937); Paul Joüon (1939); Childs (1962: 50-9); Kline (1962); Cunchillos (1969); Cassuto (1973a); Clines (1979); van Gemeren (1981); Westermann (1984-6: [1] 363-83); Hendel (1987a; 1987b).

¹⁸⁶ Or 'gods': Westermann (1984-6: [1] 364).

¹⁸⁷ The fem., pl. form of the Heb. טוֹב, to 'be pleasant, agreeable, good, fair' (HALOT 370-1), portrays how the female mortals are figured: Cassuto (1961: 294).

¹⁸⁸ The identity of the נפילים, a mythological remnant, is not known now. It occurs again in Num 13.33, described as giants (cf. LXX), 'whose descendants survived till the days of Moses and Joshua'. As 'heroes', cf. Targum Onkelos. But its verbal root נפל, to 'fall' (HALOT 709-11; cf. Ezek 32.27), may allude to a "'fall" of angels from heaven' here: Skinner (1910: 145-6); cf. Cassuto (1961: 298); thus, 'fallen ones': Targum Jonathan. They are referred to as the result from the 'sexual intercourse' of gods with mortals (Delitzsch, 1888a: 224-5; Westermann, 1984-6: [1] 378; hence, "mythical semi-divine beings" like Gilgamesh), whomsoever they may have meant originally.

when¹⁸⁹ the sons of God came in unto the daughters of Adam, and they bore (children) to them;

v. 4c

המה הנברים אשר מעולם אנשי השם

they were the mighty ones, who (were) of old, men of the name.

In these passages, male deities take female humans as their wives, who bear their sons. Due to this divine-human relationship, according to the descriptions, the immortality of mankind is taken by Yahweh (v. 3). It seems that fragments of the mythical tradition before the flood had been edited here by the author¹⁹⁰.

However a question remains concerning the identity of the progenitors. Whilst the *בני (ה)אלהים* here has been construed as mortals¹⁹¹, it can be more probably identified as 'divine beings' in a mythological context¹⁹².

¹⁸⁹ At this place the *אשר* is best understood as temporal: Cassuto (1961: 298). Westermann (1984-6: [1] 377) explains that v. 4b was originally a principal sentence in the narrative, and v. 4a and v. 4c were circumstantial sentences: 'v. 4b reports a sequence of two actions' (sc. v. 4a and v. 4c). In the present form, 4b occurs as a subordinate sentence. Westermann (1984-6: [1] 366) views the texts as a sequence of vv. 1-2; v. 4b; and v. 4c; thus, v. 3 and v. 4a are placed 'out of its context'. Meanwhile, Wyatt (his own print of translation) interprets more cogently that the Nephilim (v. 4a) are the offspring resulted by the divine-human relationship (v. 4b), after reordering three different fragments of the texts: thus, first fragment: v. 1 and v. 3; second: v. 2 and v. 4b; and third: v. 4a and 4c.

¹⁹⁰ Parker (1999c: 796).

¹⁹¹ Cf. Donat Poulet (1942: 295); Birney (1970: 45).

¹⁹² This view is favoured by the majority of interpreters. Cassuto (1961: 291-2) correctly comments that the *בני (ה)אלהים* occurs here in 'contradistinction' to the *בני אדם*. Cf. Childs (1962: 50-59); W.H. Schmidt (1967: 243-6); Loretz (1967; 1968: 31-48); Cunchillos (1969), *et al.* Some view the phrase as "angels": Delitzsch (1888a: 222; and for further discussion on their identity, cf. 222-6), saying that 'men of eminent position are elsewhere distinguished as *בני איש* from *בני אדם*'; also, Dillmann (1897: 233); Skinner (1910: 141-2); Cassuto (1961: 292-4); Gibson (1981-2: [1] 159); and Sarna (1989: 356 n. 2): 'the "divine beings" were thought of as being angels'. In fact, it is not appropriate to refer the phrase to 'angels' since it only contains the literal meaning of 'messengers': see a lexical discussion of

Parker suspects that they are divine for two main reasons: 1) the distinction between divine and human is confused by having intercourse with female humans; and 2) there is no mention of the relationship between Yahweh and these entities; Yahweh has no role in this event¹⁹³.

Yet these problems can be solved if their identity is considered within the mythological context since there appear the remains of an earlier mythological tradition¹⁹⁴: 1) the texts tell of a divine impregnation; it is not rare to see the anthropomorphic motif of the ancient heroes generated from gods in the ancient epic (cf. Greek epic)¹⁹⁵; 2) it would be unnecessary to mention here Yahweh's relationship with the divine beings if they are construed as 'fallen divine beings', separate from Yahweh¹⁹⁶; hence, it can be understood as the author's theological interpretation which is inspired from an early biblical demonology in order to explain the reason for the immorality of human beings before the flood in order to justify the judgment of Yahweh¹⁹⁷; and 3) the mention of the depriving of their immortality in v. 3

the term in Chapter III. Thus it can be understood more accurately as the 'divine beings' (sc. 'gods'). Cf. Gunkel (1997: 56) comments that it indicates the 'beings belonging to the category of אלהים'.

¹⁹³ Parker (1999c: 798-9).

¹⁹⁴ Westermann (1984-6: [1] 368) concludes that the text of Gen 6:1-4 'contains two narratives of different origin': thus, 'one is purely etiological and is really an elaborated genealogical note explaining the origin of the giants'; and the other is a 'mythical story that told of a dangerous transgression of the bounds of the human state by the sons of God that caused God to intervene'. But it rather seems to be derived from the same tradition, if we see that the נפלים and the גבורים are indications of the same progenies that have resulted from the human-divine relationship. In fact, the latter describes the function of the נפלים.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Delitzsch (1888a: 233); Skinner (1910: 140-1). Cassuto (1961: 299) cogently relates this motif to the Gracious Gods (Shahar and Shalem) in the Ugaritic texts. See discussion on these gods above.

¹⁹⁶ As 'demons': Delitzsch (1888a: 225-6), citing Keil. See Gibson (1981-2: [1] 161): the בני (ה)אלהים were 'rebellious angels like Satan himself in the later Jewish and Christian stories'. Also, cf. Sarna (1989: 45).

¹⁹⁷ Cassuto (1961: 294). The texts explain the reason for God's punishment as the introduction to the flood episode (Dillmann, 1897: 230-2; followed by S.R. Driver, 1909: 82;

would not make sense if they are mortals. Thus, it probably indicates divine beings¹⁹⁸.

The textual context contrasts with the argument of Sarna: the בן 'has no biological implication but has the sense of "belonging to the class of"'¹⁹⁹. However, the בני (ה)אלהים here connotes not only the membership of lesser deities, but also their theogonic relation to the supreme god, inasmuch as the בני האדם is contrastingly juxtaposed with it to express the different origin of each entity. The generation of their offspring may presuppose the generation of lesser deities themselves through their father god; hence, the descriptions allude to the kinship relation of the lesser deities to the supreme god.

In this regard, Cooke remarks properly that 'it was more probably understood in a generic sense: the 'sons of God(s)' are those who are of the realm of the gods, who partake of divinity'; and he says also that 'Therefore, the view that filial relation is present here must depend wholly on a rather weak argument by analogy'²⁰⁰.

1.1.2. Deuteronomy 32.8

Deut 32.8 assumes a similar construction. The song of Moses in the text allows the legitimate functioning of other gods for other peoples. For this, it has been suggested that the בני אלהים or בני אלים is to be read in the text:

בהנחל עליון גוים	When ²⁰¹ Elyon ²⁰² gave the
	nations (their) inheritance,

Dexinger, 1966; Coxon, 1999: 345), or as put here by J, but not originally part of the flood narrative, to increase the 'sinfulness of man before God' (Childs, 1962: 58). At any rate the final form of the texts culminates in the reason for the flood. Against this view: Westermann (1984-6: [1] 368).

¹⁹⁸ Mensching (1958: 9).

¹⁹⁹ Sarna (1989: 356 n. 2).

²⁰⁰ G. Cooke (1964: 24).

²⁰¹ Heb. ב 'introduces a temporal infinitive-clause' with a 'temporal notion': HALOT

Whilst MT reads the last phrase following the term *למספר בני ישראל* as *בני ישראל*, 'sons of Israel', LXX understands it as *ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*, 'angels of God', which presupposes the *בני (ה)אלהים* or *בני אלה*, 'sons of God'²⁰³ or 'sons of gods'²⁰⁴. Other evidences support this: Qumran (4QDeut)²⁰⁵, Symmachus and Old Latin, etc. Thus, the latter reading more clearly exposes the intention of the phraseology in a contrastive parallelism with the phrase *בני אדם*, 'sons of Adam'. Thus, Wyatt explains the reason that the *בני (ה)אלהים* are "older gods having been transformed into angels, in accordance with a common practice in the later period"²⁰⁶.

In accordance with Deut 32.6b, it is more evident that their *Vorlage*, *בני (ה)אלהים* or *בני אלה*, indicates the kinship relation of divine beings to Yahweh:

הלווא הוא אבִּיךָ קִנָּךְ

Is he not your father, your creator²⁰⁷?

²⁰² Or, 'Most High' as a divine epithet: BDB 751; HALOT 832-3; and most major translations such as NASB, NJPS, and RSV, etc. Cf. Ug. *ʿly*: UT §19.1855; WUS no. 2030; and DUL 161 (I).

²⁰³ Mullen (1980: 202-3); D.L. Christensen (2002: 790, 796).

²⁰⁴ De Moor (1997: 256 n. 232) suggests that the *אלה* was removed from the Hebrew text later on, as in Deut 32.8, Ps 56.1 and 58.2'. BHS presupposes *אל בני* or *אלים בני*; thus, Wyatt (1996: 349-40) translates it as 'sons of El'; and cf. G.A. Smith (1918: 347); and Newsom (1992: 248).

²⁰⁵ Qumran reads *בני אלהים*.

²⁰⁶ In addition, Wyatt (1996: 350) observes that 'Angels in later parlance are commonly the gods of the older theology'.

²⁰⁷ Heb. *קנה*, to 'acquire, buy, and create': HALOT 1111-3; W.H. Schmidt (1997b: 1147-9, including his bibliography for this possible translation; and 1151-3). Its meaning, to 'create', is attested also in the usage of Ug. *qny*; to 'acquire, create, forge, and procreate': DUL 706-7. Further meaning of *קנה*, to 'produce, beget, bear', therefore, can be suggested: W.H.

Wyatt cogently suggests that Heb. עשך at this place may have a sexual nuance so that an allusion to the theogony is possibly suggested²⁰⁹. God's creativity, or his procreativity, in his address to the 'people' in v. 6 may be applied to his 'lesser gods' as well.

Returning to the text, the role of the presupposed אלהים (ה) בני or אלהים is described here as 'agents executing a Divine commission'²¹⁰: sc. 'ruling gods' or 'guardian deities' of the earth²¹¹. In the passages, each of the nations and the territories are arranged by the עליון, 'Elyon'²¹², as allocated to each of his divine agents²¹³ (cf. the celestial warfare of Michael with the national god of Persia in Dan 10.13²¹⁴).

Schmidt (*ibid.*: esp., 1147-9; for biblical references, cf. Gen 4.1; Deut 32.6; Ps 139.13; and Prov 8.22). Dahood (1972: 96) points out the semantic parallelism between אב and כון (in a polel form) in v. 6 and between Ug. *ab* and *kn* in KTU 1.4 iv 47-8 (see n. 1, above). Thus, either the translation into 'creator' (NIV) or 'progenitor' (Wyatt, 1996: 247) would be accepted.

²⁰⁸ Heb. כון, to 'establish': HALOT 464-5. Its Ug. cognate \sqrt{kn} denotes also 'create': cf. UT §19.1213; WUS no. 1335; and DUL 447. Wyatt (2002: 255 and n. 23) construes the \sqrt{kn} of the Ug. *ykn* at KTU 1.17 i 25 as to 'beget' rather than to 'establish'; thus:

<i>tr il aby ...</i>	Bull El my father ...
<i>bny bnwt</i>	O Creator-of-creatures,
<i>w ykn bnh b btt</i>	so that he may beget a son in his house

(KTU 1.17 i 23-5).

The context of the text makes this translation possible.

²⁰⁹ A remark of Wyatt (1996: 247-8) is noteworthy for the translation of this verb: the עשך, 'sandwiched between verbs with a sexual nuance, must belong in the same semantic field'.

²¹⁰ S.R. Driver (1909: 82).

²¹¹ G.A. Smith (1918: 347).

²¹² It is suggested plausibly that Heb. עליון corresponds to Ug. *aliyn* (|| b7): Johnson (1967: 50-1 n. 4).

²¹³ Newsom (1992: 249). Thus, Wyatt (1996: 350) points out that in the final form of the texts it presupposes a theological suggestion that 'each of the nations has a guardian angel', and that their original identities were gods. For further discussion of the relation of gods and the nations in our text, see Block (1988: 7-22).

²¹⁴ Collins (1993: 374): the 'prince of the kingdom of Persia' designates the 'patron angel of Persia'.

The Targum inserts 'seventy' into the text for their number (cf. the 'seventy nations' in Gen 10 and the 'seventy sons'²¹⁵ of Jacob in Gen 46.27 and Deut 10.22). On the other hand, it has been suggested plausibly that the seventy sons of God (or 'El') is related to the Ugaritic formula represented in the *šb^cm bn atrt*, the 'seventy Sons of Athirat'²¹⁶, whose husband appears as El (KTU 1.23); thus they may also be called the 'seventy sons of El'²¹⁷.

Eissfeldt has supposed here that Yahweh is one of the seventy gods who is in subordination to El Elyon²¹⁸. Parker argued also that Elyon is an independent god who gave the Israelites and their land to Yahweh, as each people is assigned to each god on the basis of their identical number²¹⁹; hence, according to him, Yahweh becomes one of lesser gods of Elyon.

However, Elyon here is understood as an epithet of Yahweh²²⁰: Elyon is identified as Yahweh elsewhere (אל עליון; Gen 14.18-20; Num 24.16; Isa 14.14; and *passim* in Pss); Elyon is proclaimed as Possessor/Creator of heaven and earth (Gen 14.19; cf. Deut 32.6; Ps 139.13; and Prov 8.22). Therefore, it is more convincing that Yahweh appears here as the distributor of the territories and the ruling god to peoples.

²¹⁵ Whilst MT reads 'seventy' in Exod 1.5 for the number of the sons of Jacob and their family, LXX and Qumran read 'seventy-five' (cf. Acts 7.14); the latter number includes the additional children of Ephraim and Manasseh (cf. Gen 46.20 of LXX). See Klein (1974: 14-5) and Wyatt (1996: 350 n. 220).

²¹⁶ For this view, see Tournay (1949: 53); Albright (1959: 343); Barthélemy (1963: 295-7); and Wyatt (1996: 295; and cf. 350 and n. 223); they are 'precisely identifiable with the seventy sons of Asherah of the Ugaritic tradition, to become the guardian angels of the nations'.

²¹⁷ Cf. Wyatt (1996: 350).

²¹⁸ Eissfeldt (1956: 28-9). It is rejected by Block (1988: 14 n. 18) and Wyatt (1996: 350-1).

²¹⁹ Parker (1999c: 796).

²²⁰ G. Cooke (1964: 32-4); Johnson (1967: 48-50); and cf. Wyatt (1996: 350-1).

ויהי היום	Then came the day ²²² ;
ויבאו בני האלהים להתיצב על יהוה	when the sons of God ²²³ came to stand ²²⁴ before Yahweh,
ויבוא גם השטן בתוכם	and the Adversary ²²⁵ also came into the midst of them

(Job 1.6).

Job 1.6 and 2.1 describe that the בני (ה)אלהים presented themselves to Yahweh, and Satan was among them. Davidson claimed that the בני (ה)אלהים at this place does not mean literally “‘sons of God’ as if they had actually derived their nature from Him as a child from its father” since they were created²²⁶. Strahan similarly argued that the בני (ה)אלהים is not construed ‘in

²²¹ The scene of the divine court takes place twice and the same phraseology is applied in each case, with only small variations.

²²² Whilst some interpret ‘the day’ at this place as a specifically appointed day (Morgenstern, 1939: 44-50 and n. 29: i.e. ‘the New Year’s Day’; Dhorme, 1967: 5; and Vermeylen, 1986: 8), others understand, more acceptably, that it designates the ‘particular day when it happened: i.e. “on a certain day”’: thus, Kautzsch (1910: §126; 4.s; Habel (1985: 88-9); A.B. Davidson (1889: 6); Paul Joüon (1923: §137; n); and Parker (1999c: 798).

²²³ Or, ‘sons of Elohim’: Dhorme (1967: 5, 15).

²²⁴ As a nonverbal indication, the verb denotes their status as lesser deities before Yahweh. Cf. Tur-Sinai (1957: 11). It is implied that Yahweh is being ‘seated (on a throne)’, as at 1 Kgs 22.19 (cf. v. 22): Driver-Gray (1921: 9).

²²⁵ Heb. שטן, ‘adversary, also a DN’: HALOT 1317. With the definite article the noun becomes a proper DN, Satan: S.R. Driver (1908: 2. n. h.). Strahan (1914: 38) argued that it is ‘not yet a proper name, but the official title of one of the sons of the Elohim’ (also, A.B. Davidson, 1889: 7; Driver-Gray, 1921: 10; Morgenstern, 1939: 41-2 and n. 26; and Habel, 1985: 89); he further insists that ‘he is not a fallen angel, but one of God’s agents, who comes with the others to report his service’. However, it is not convincing for his appearance in the divine council is distinguished from other celestial members (בְּתוֹכָם, גַּם), as if he is not a regular member of the council or an unexpected visitor.

²²⁶ A.B. Davidson (1889: 6-7).

the physical sense “begotten of God,” nor even in the moral sense “akin to God,” but as beings who belong to the family or class of the Elohim, just as members of the human race are called either “men” or “sons of men,” and members of the prophetic order either “prophets” or “sons of the prophets”²²⁷.

Yet the phrase here occurs evidently as a mythological expression, as in Gen 6.1-4 above. As seen in any other mythological descriptions in the Hebrew Bible, the original ‘kinship’ sense of the phrase may still be suggested. Their identification as “created angels” may have been interpreted and developed later to enhance the biblical “monotheism”²²⁸ from the early Israelite concept of lesser deities, which has many affinities with the Ugaritic concept of them, whose ‘kinship’ indications are attested.

Tur-Sinai here reads the בני (ה)אלהים not as ‘sons of (the one) God’, but as the ‘godly beings’ or ‘divine creatures’²²⁹. But the second element is better construed as the DN, the controlling figure of the divine council, and the first one indicates the kinship relation of a subordinate group to the controlling figure, like the Ugaritic expression *bn il*, ‘sons of El’. These entities are understood here as lesser gods²³⁰; they appear to attend the council of the gods as its members. Then Yahweh initiates a discussion in the heavenly court (1.8; 2.3), the Adversary offers a proposal (1.9-11; 2.4-5), and Yahweh accepts it and permits him to take action (1.12; 2.6).

²²⁷ Strahan (1914: 37).

²²⁸ Wyatt (1996: 351).

²²⁹ Tur-Sinai (1957: 10-11).

²³⁰ Driver-Gray (1921: 10) rightly comment that the בני (ה)אלהים (Gen 6.2; Job 2.1; 38.7) belong to the class of gods and other designations the בני אלים (Ps 29.1; 89.7) and the בר אלהים (Dan 3.25) can be referred to the אלהים, ‘gods’ (Ps 82.1, 6), or אלה (Ps 58.2). LXX reads the terms as οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, ‘the messengers (angels) of God’ (Job 2.1, 38.7); also cf. Targum. Cf. S.R. Driver (1908: 2 n. g.).

1.1.4. בני אלים

The expression *בני אלים* appears in Ps 29.1, 89.7 [ET 89.6], and probably in Deut 32.8 to indicate lesser deities, who are compared to describe the wonders and the faithfulness of Yahweh. It has been debated whether the second element of the phrase should be read as singular²³¹ or as a plural²³². The most convincing is the view of a single god; thus, 'sons of God', like the Ugaritic expression *bn ilm*, 'sons of El'²³³.

1.2. 'Sons of Elyon' בני עליין

The expression בני עליין is found as a hapax legomenon at Ps 82.6. In Ps 82.2-5, accusation is brought and judgment is made in the celestial council²³⁴. As a result, the verdict made by the council is delivered to the accused ones. In vv. 6-7, Yahweh accuses some 'gods'²³⁵ before the divine assembly for their failure to keep justice on the earth. Yahweh then passes a sentence:

v. 6 אני אמרתי אלהים אתם ובני עליין כלכם

I have said 'You are gods and sons of Elyon²³⁶, all of you';

²³¹ LXX reads the phrase in Ps 29.1 and 89.7 as υἱοὶ θεοῦ, 'sons of God'. Tsevat (1955: 128-9) and Hummel (1957: 101-2) read the last consonant of מַלְאִים as an enclitic *m*; followed by Freedman (1960: 104-5).

²³² Avishur (1994: 78) says that the phrase בני אלים corresponds to אלה in Ps 89.7 and Exod 15.11, respectively.

²³³ Ug. -*m* on *ilm* is to be an enclitic *m*.

²³⁴ Morgenstern (1939: esp., 40-59), Tsevat (1969: esp., 126-7), and Mullen (1980: 230) agree that the divine trial takes place in the divine council.

²³⁵ Parker (1995: 536) defines the accused ones as the members of the divine assembly, whose roles are to govern the earth; cf. Mowinckel (1962: [1] 150); Dahood (1966-70: [2] 268); Weiser (1962: 556, 559); Tsevat (1969: 128-32); Tate (1972: 593); Mullen (1980: 230). Also, see Jüngling (1969).

²³⁶ Morgenstern (1939: 92) argues that "Elyon here is not identical with Yahweh, but is an altogether different deity" who may be recognised as a major deity of Byblos. However, it appears explicitly as an epithet of Yahweh in Gen 14:22 (cf. v. 18); see the discussion under Deut 32.8 above.

(but) truly like Adam shall you die²³⁷;

v. 7

וכאחד השרים תפלו

and like the first²³⁸ of the princes²³⁹ shall you fall

(Ps 82.6-7).

It has been postulated that the accused ones are mortals. Thus, אלהים and בני עליין refer to the corrupt human judges in Israel²⁴⁰; or kings of Judah or Israel, whose government has been far removed from the 'ideals of true monarchy'²⁴¹, on the basis of the previous verses 2-4. They have also been referred to as the rulers of foreign nations who oppress the Israelites, and who consider themselves gods²⁴².

However, their immortality, presupposed in v. 7, alludes to their status as 'gods'²⁴³; Yahweh's statement of their status as 'gods' in v. 6 is

²³⁷ Heb. מוֹת, to 'die': HALOT: 562-3. Cf. Ug. *mt*: UT §19.1443; WUS no. 1703; and DUL 595-6; Aram. *mwt*: DNWSI 605-7; Akk. *mātu*: AHw 634-5; CAD 10/1[M] 421-7. Cf. O'Callaghan (1953: 311, n. 4) reads the text as 'become mortal' following Ginsberg's rendering (Ginsberg, 1945: 21 n. 52) of Ug. *mt* as 'mortal'.

²³⁸ Heb. אֶחָד is paralleled with הַשְּׂרִים here. Heb. אֶחָד is normally construed as 'one' (of the princes), but rather it is to be taken here in the ordinal sense: 'the first...', as it may be seen also at Gen 1.5 and Ruth 1.4. Cf. Wyatt (1996: 363 and n. 14, suggesting the same Ugaritic usage of *aḥd* at KTU 1.6 i 46; see Wyatt, 2002: 131 n. 70). In this point, Adam can be regarded as the first one who has had a kingship in the royal ideology.

²³⁹ Heb. שָׂר is used for the persons with a high rank in their political, societal, and religious status; thus, its meaning is variously rendered to: 'representative (of the king), commander, leader (of the group), head' (HALOT 1350-3); or 'ruler' (CHALOT, 354). With this sense it refers either to mortal military captains (Judg 4.2; 1 Sam 17.55) or to divine agents (Josh 5.14-5; Dan 10.13, 21; and 21.1). The term may indicate the royal status of Adam at this place.

²⁴⁰ Cohen (1945: 270-1); O'Callaghan (1953); and cf. McKenzie (1945: 337): (human) "judges are divine because they share the authority of Yahweh and in His name deal justice to men".

²⁴¹ Wyatt (1996: 361-5; esp. see 362-3), specifying Delitzsch's idea, which suggests it as the (Israelite) 'chiefs of the assembly' (Delitzsch, 1888b: 459, 461).

²⁴² Briggs (1906-7: [2] 215).

²⁴³ Morgenstern (1939: 33).

logically related to his verdict on them to be demoted from their 'divine status' and to be reduced to mortals in v. 7. Accordingly, the four terms, אדם, מות, שר, and נפל, in the texts, resulting from their failure to be just, are intentionally put here to be juxtaposed with the other two terms, which convey their contrasting denotations: sc. אלהים²⁴⁴ and בני עליין²⁴⁵. Thus, some point out cogently that these accused entities refer to 'angels'²⁴⁶ or 'gods'²⁴⁷ of the pantheon.

Tur-Sinai has argued that in v. 6 the בני עליין, 'may have originated in a later period, when the proper sense of the usual expression בני אלים was no longer perceived'²⁴⁸. But it is not convincing that the expression בני עליין may have been used later than the בני אלים if we consider its corresponding Ugaritic expression. Therefore, it is more probable that they both may have had earlier traditions for their usage.

1.2.1. 'Fallen' Gods

Morgenstern suggests that these divine beings are related to the בני (ה)אלהים and נפלים mentioned in Gen 6.2, 4²⁴⁹. According to him, vv. 1-3 of Gen 6 is related intimately to v. 4; hence, the divine beings in vv. 1-3 are identified with the Nephilim in v. 4²⁵⁰. On the basis of Morgenstern's suggestion, Wyatt remarks, relating the text of the psalm to Gen 6.1-4, that Gen 6.1-3

²⁴⁴ Heb. אדם (2. masc. pl. pron. form) in v. 6 evidently indicates the fact that אלהים denotes plural divine beings at this place.

²⁴⁵ The expression בני עליין is stressed under a parallelism with אלהים. These two epithets may be evidence of the fact that the lesser gods are closely related to Elyon Yahweh in their kinship.

²⁴⁶ Leslie (1949: 117, 230); Kissane (1964: 377-8); and Eaton (1967: 204).

²⁴⁷ Dahood (1966-70: [2] 268); Mowinckel (1962: [1] 148-51; [2] 132); Weiser (1962: 556, 559); Tsevat (1969); Loretz (1971: 113-5); Mullen (1980: 230); and Parker (1999c: 794, 7-8). Cf., less probably, 'pagan gods/Canaanite gods': Mowinckel (1962: [1] 222); Holladay (1993: 22).

²⁴⁸ Tur-Sinai (1957: 11)

²⁴⁹ Morgenstern (1939: 83-107).

²⁵⁰ Heb. נפלים may denote 'fallen ones' literally.

'incorporates the originally distinct myth of the fall of Satan and his companions, to be identified with the Nephilim (lit. "fallen ones") of 6.4'²⁵¹.

Although the text of the psalm has been revised into its the present form²⁵², it still allows a possibility of viewing them as 'divine beings' with regard to other biblical references. Thus, some divine entities are incorporated with the motif of 'falling' (cf. Ezek 28). Moreover, the idea of Yahweh's punishment of lesser deities for the crime is found elsewhere (cf. Isa 14.12²⁵³; 24.21; and Zech 3.1-2, etc.). But it seems that the figures in vv. 2-4 of Ps 82 are more closely related to the אלהים (ה) בני in Gen 6.2-4 for the corrupt activities of divine beings, rather than to the נפלים, the semi-divine figures, although their epithet alludes to the 'falling' motif as well.

1.2.2. "bn 'lyn" in the Ugaritic Texts

If we find an Ugaritic parallel to the lesser deities in Ps 82.6-7, it may be connected to the Gracious Gods: sc. Shahr and Shalem. Accepting Morgenstern's idea that Ps 82.6-7 are 'based on ancient Canaanite mythology', Gaster suggests that the three terms אלהים, בני עליון, and שרים in the verses above refer to Shahr and Shalem in KTU 1.23, who were called *ilm*, 'gods', *bn šrm*, 'princes', and *'lynm*, 'those on high'²⁵⁴. Thus, KTU 1.23.1-3 read:

<i>iqra ilm n^c[mm]</i>	Let me invoke ²⁵⁵ the gra[cious] gods
<i>w ysmm bn šp[]</i>	and beautiful ²⁵⁶ , sons of Shap[sh]

²⁵¹ Wyatt (1996: 361 n. 8).

²⁵² Wyatt (1996: 361-2).

²⁵³ In the verse, as Morgenstern points out, the fall of the Babylonian king, or of the oppressive rulers, is recounted mythologically.

²⁵⁴ Gaster (1946b: 71).

²⁵⁵ Ug. *qr*, to 'call, invoke, proclaim': DUL 708. Cf. Heb. קרא: HALOT 1128-31; Akk. *qarā'u*, *qerû*: AHw 918; CAD 13[Q] 242-3; and Arab. *qara'a*: AEL 2502-4. It may be taken here in a cohortative mood: Wyatt (2002: 325).

Gaster restores the *bn šp[]* as *bn š[rm]* ('princes') on the basis of *šrm* at KTU 1.23.22²⁵⁸. Yet, because the second letter of the *šp[]* is just visible, the *šp[]* is best read as *šp[š]*. Thus, they may be identified as the 'sons of Shapsh'²⁵⁹. He also reads the *ʕy[]* as *ʕy[nm]*, 'them on hi(gh)'²⁶⁰, identifying the presupposed *ʕynm* as the Gracious Gods. Wyatt takes the last line as 'let them give a feast to [those] of high rank'²⁶¹. Others render it as follows: 'who establish a city on high'²⁶²; or 'may glory be given to the exalted ones'²⁶³.

Whilst some commentators restore the *ʕy[]* to a plural form, *ʕy[nm]*, it is possibly read at this place as a singular, *ʕy[n]*²⁶⁴, however. Thus, the last line may be best understood as a human aspiration for the lesser deities to worship the supreme god enthroned in the pantheon (cf. *mt w šr*²⁶⁵ in line 8). As the Gracious Gods are called the sons of Shapsh, they can be discerned as the *bn ʕyn*, the 'Sons of High One (or Most High)'²⁶⁶ like the בני עליון in the

²⁵⁶ Ug. *ysm*, 'handsome, pleasant': DUL 984 (I); 'beautiful': UT §19.1119. Cf. Akk. *wasmu*, *wussumu*: AHw 1474, 1498; CAD 1/2[A] 337.

²⁵⁷ Ug. *qrt*, 'glory, honour': Ginsberg (1935b: 47); G.R. Driver (1956: 713); del Olmo (1981: 621); DUL 713 (II). Cf. Heb. יָקָר: HALOT 432.

²⁵⁸ Gaster (1946b: 51 and 71 n. 100). Virolleaud (1933: 129, 132) also reads it as *bn š[rm(?)]*, 'sons of a prince(?)'; cf. Ginsberg (1935b: 64) takes the same reading, but 'sons of princes'.

²⁵⁹ Wyatt (2002: 325).

²⁶⁰ Gaster (1946b: 51, 71 and n. 101), following a reading of Ginsberg (1935b: 46).

²⁶¹ Wyatt (2002: 325; and cf. n. 3).

²⁶² Caquot-Szzyr (1974: 369); Gibson (1978: 123); de Moor (1987: 118); and Pardee (1997: 276).

²⁶³ Ginsberg (1935b: 46, 64); Xella (1973: 41-2); del Olmo (1981: 440); and Hettema (1989-90: 82).

²⁶⁴ Or, possibly, *ʕy[n il ?]*.

²⁶⁵ Wyatt (1977; 1992b; and 2002: 326 n. 10) convincingly refers this to an epithet of El.

²⁶⁶ De Moor (1979: 652-3; 1990: 69) has suggested that El can be called *ʕyn*, with his own different reading of KTU 1.111.17-8, on the basis of the photographs distributed in Ug VII; thus: *šb^c alpm ʕy[n] il mlk*, 'Seven oxen (for) the Most High, El the King'. Cf. Gen 14:18: king Melchizedek of Selem was a priest of אֵל עֵלְיוֹן, 'El, Most High'. But later, he (de Moor,

psalm. Since they all appear as sons of El (KTU 1.23.52-66) the *ʿlyn* is referred to, most probably, as an epithet of El.

In any case, the *ilm*, *bn šp[š]*, and *ʿly[n]* in the texts are related to Shahr and Shalem. Thus, the *ilm* (KTU 1.23.1, 23, 58, 60, and 67) and *ʿlyn* (KTU 1.23.3), with another epithet *tn šrm*, ‘two Princes’ (KTU 1.23.22), may be suggested as possibly paralleled expressions to the descriptions of the fallen gods in Ps 82.6-7.

On the other hand, less probably, it has been related also to the Ugaritic royal ideology. O’Callaghan has tried to find a motif of the figures in Ps 82.2-4 from the royal figure, Danel, who ‘tried the case of the widow (and) judged the lawsuit of the orphan’²⁶⁷, but preferred to connect it to King Keret²⁶⁸, who was called more mythologically as the *bn il*, ‘son of El’²⁶⁹.

In fact, the story of Keret in a situation of dying like a mortal from his illness²⁷⁰ seems to be paralleled with Ps 82, in the point that his fatal illness is

1997: 74 n. 198) took a step back from his argument: “Apparently this title may be compared to that of *ʿlyn*, a title of El according to later Canaanite sources which, however, is not attested in the texts of Ugarit thus far”. However, his point on the identification of El with the epithet ‘Most High’ is still worthy of our attention.

²⁶⁷ Thus the text reads *yd n dn almnt ytp tpt ytm* (KTU 1.17 v 7-8). Wyatt (2002: 267 and n. 73) argues that these activities are ‘typical royal duties, as at KTU 1.16 vi 33-34, 45-48’. Also cf. Wyatt (1999: 249-51).

²⁶⁸ O’Callaghan (1953: 312 and n. 7).

²⁶⁹ O’Callaghan (1953: 313) denies its connection to Gen 1-4, arguing that ‘The Keret passages suggest that verses 2-4 should be retained and that there is no reason to call upon Gn 6, 1-4 to explain them’.

²⁷⁰ Keret’s immortality is addressed in his son’s lamentation of his illness: *ap ab i k mtm tmtn*, ‘but father, oh, like mortals do you die?’ (KTU 1.16 i 3-4, 17-18); *ap krt bnm il šph ltpn w qdš*, ‘then, is Keret the son of El, the offspring of the Wise and Holy One?’ (KTU 1.16 i 9-11; 20-22); *bl mtk* [readings are slightly different: *bl mtk* (KTU¹⁺²); *blmtk* (UT 125.15; CTA); *b lmtk* (del Olmo-Sanmartín, 2004: 297)] *ngln*, ‘in your immortality we rejoice’ (KTU 1.16 i 15); *u ilm tmtn šph ltpn l yh*, ‘or do the gods die, the offspring of the Wise One not live?’ (KTU 1.16 i 22-23).

due to his failure in executing his royal duties²⁷¹. Yet, it is more plausible to see the accused figures as lesser gods charged with ruling the earth, and probably related to other mythological stories, such as the בני האלהים in Gen 6.1-4 or the Gracious Gods in Ugaritic mythology.

1.2.3. National Gods

The deities in the psalm may have been obliged to preside over the nations as 'ruling gods' or 'national gods', as suggested in Deut 32.8-9²⁷²; but their mission seems to have failed with regard to the keeping of justice. Thus, it may be concluded that these divine beings are charged with the task of making judgments on humans. Yet, as a result of their failure in the task, they are discharged and expelled from their divine privilege.

1.3. קדשים 'Holy Ones'

Whilst exactly the same expression for the Ugaritic phrase *bn qdš* is not attested in the biblical Hebrew texts, Heb. קדשים²⁷³ may correspond to Ug. *bn qdš* and represent their father god's attribute, just like the Ugaritic phrase.

1.3.1. Psalm 89.6-9 [ET 5-8]

In Ps 89.6-9, Yahweh is well described as surrounded by a multitude of lesser gods:

²⁷¹ O'Callaghan (1953: 313). Thus, Ugaritic texts inform that *l tdn dn almnt l tpt tpt qsr npš l tdy qšm 'l dl*, 'you have not tried the case of the widow; you have not judged the lawsuit of the weak spirit; you have not banished the oppressors of the poor' (KTU 1.16 vi 45-48; cf. 33-34).

²⁷² Thus, Tsevat (1969: 133) proposes Deut 32.8-9 also as the background of the psalm.

²⁷³ Heb. קדשים, 'holy ones' (HALOT 1072-8; cf. 1066-7) occurs as the masc. pl. form of קדש, to 'be holy'. Cf. Akk. *qadāšu*; *qašdu*: AHw 891, 906-7; CAD 13[Q] 46-7, 146-7; Ug. *qdš*: UT §19.2210; WUS no. 2393; DUL 695-6; Pu., Pun., Aram. *qdš*: DNWSI 994-7. It is used as a reference to Yahweh (Josh 24.19; Prov 9.10, 30.3; and Hos 12.1) as well as the 'divine beings' (Job 5.1; 15.15). Cf. the usage of אלהים for Yahweh. Thus, it should be decided in the context of the texts.

In the passages, each of the three designations for the collectivity of divine beings is stressed in a parallel construction: בקהל קדשים, 'in the assembly of Holy Ones' (v. 6); בבני אלים, 'among the Sons of God' (v. 7); and בסוד קדשים, 'in the council of Holy Ones' (v. 8). They all support the fact that the divine assembly consists of Yahweh and other divine beings. These plural conceptions contrast Yahweh's uniqueness²⁷⁹.

The position of these divine beings is mentioned in the cola: כל סביביו, 'all *who* are around him' (v. 8); and their liturgical behaviour for the supreme god is addressed in v. 6²⁸⁰. Their rank as inferior figures may be indicated by their position surrounding Yahweh, who *sits*²⁸¹ in the centre of the divine council. These scenes remind us of a similar picture in Ps 29.1-2 of the בני אלים, 'Sons of God²⁸²', who gave praise to Yahweh. Moreover, their rendering of praise to Yahweh may designate their hierarchical status, which is subordinate to him. Hence, these indications undoubtedly mark Yahweh's distinguished status from other divine beings ranked as a lesser class²⁸³. Their additional title צבאות, 'hosts²⁸⁴', in v. 9 confirms this fact (cf. 1 Kgs 22.19). Their role here is as a military force demonstrating Yahweh's absolute sovereignty.

The divine epithet קדשים suggests the conclusion that these divine beings are sons of Yahweh, representing the 'holy' presence of their paternal god. It is evident in other passages that holiness is an attribute of divine beings: Deut 33.2; Dan 4.10, 14, and 20 [ET 13, 17, and 23]²⁸⁵.

²⁷⁹ Parker (1999b: 719).

²⁸⁰ J.M. Ward (1961: 325) and Coppens (1963: 486).

²⁸¹ His sitting position can be inferred from כסאך, 'your throne', in v. 15.

²⁸² BHS comments that a few Mss read אילים here.

²⁸³ Parker (1999c: 798).

²⁸⁴ The term will be discussed in the category of צבאות (Host) in Chapter IV. For a synonymic meaning of 'host' and 'council', see Cross (1953: 274 n. 1).

²⁸⁵ It is used also to refer to the attribute of the Babylonian gods: Dan 4.5, 6, and 15 [ET 8, 9, and 18]. It is suggested that the usage of Heb. קדש for the divine beings in the

1.3.2. Exodus 15.11

The Song of Miriam presupposes a polytheistic background²⁸⁶:

מי כמכה באלם יהוה	Who is like you among gods, Yahweh;
מי כמכה נאדר בקדש	who is like you, glorified XXX,
נורא תהלת עשה פלא	revered (in) praises, doing wonders ²⁸⁷ ?

Whilst MT has the text after the נאדר as a singular (בקדש, 'in holiness'²⁸⁸), LXX presents it as the plural form (ἐν ἁγίοις, which clearly presupposes a different Hebrew *Vorlage* בקדשים, 'among the Holy Ones'; also, Syro-Hexapla)²⁸⁹. As seen already, קדש is read as קדשים: Deut 33.2-3; Ps 29.2²⁹⁰. Its phraseology is obtained in Ps 89: בקהל קדשים, 'in the assembly of the Holy Ones' (v. 6); and בסוד קדשים, 'in the council of the Holy Ones' (v. 8). For these reasons, the same expression, בקדשים, is to be read in the present text.

Thus, the קדש [קדשים] at this place is identified as the same figures with the קדש [קדשים] in Deut 33.2-3, indicating 'the Holy Ones' in the divine assembly. As their identity is revealed in parallelism with בני אלים, 'Sons of God' elsewhere (Ps 29.1; 89.7; and Deut 32.8 [LXX]), their epithet may represent their attribute inherited from their paternal god, Yahweh.

Furthermore, the definition of the קדש [קדשים] as 'holy' gods at this place becomes more acceptable when we consider the fact that the בקדש [בקדשים] is paralleled with the באלם, 'among the gods', in the previous

Hebrew Bible has been influenced somewhat, in the formation of the early conception of lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible, by the Ugaritic conception: Cross (1953: 274 n. 1); G. Cooke (1964: 26-7).

²⁸⁶ Noth (1962: 124-5).

²⁸⁷ Whilst MT reads as a sg., LXX understands it as a pl. Moreover, a number of Mss take it as the pl. form.

²⁸⁸ S.R. Driver (1911: 136).

²⁸⁹ Cross-Freedman (1955: 242, 247); Sarna (1991: 80): sc. the 'members of the divine retinue'.

²⁹⁰ For further discussion of the texts, see Chapter I.

phrase. Hence, the אֱלֹהִים is better recognised as the 'lesser deities'²⁹¹ of Yahweh, rather than as 'pagan gods'²⁹², for the same reason.

The repeated rhetorical question²⁹³ of Yahweh's incomparability above presents the fact that any celestial beings are subordinated to the supreme god Yahweh. Yet, his 'holy' attribute may be represented through his sons, as seen in their epithet: קדְשִׁים (אֱלֹהִים בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים).

Summary

Some Hebrew terms, such as אֱלֹהִים בְּנֵי (ה) and בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, represent the kinship relation of the lesser deities to their master god in the Hebrew Bible. These mythological terms are found explicitly in the biblical references and indicate the early conception of the lesser deities in the Hebrew religion. The lesser deities of the supreme god, as well as being his sons, are charged as the national gods (Deut 32.8; cf. Ps 82.6-7). This kinship conception of the lesser deities is attested in the Ugaritic texts. In addition, there are other designations to support their kinship, emphasising continuity of the divine attribute between the son gods and their father god (e.g. קדְשִׁים).

2. The Outward Appearance of Lesser Deities in the Hebrew Bible

The enquiry will centre on the outward appearance of the lesser deities by analysing some biblical descriptions.

2.1. Judges 13.6

In the encounter with Manoah's wife the countenance of the divine messenger is described as being anthropomorphic but fearful:

²⁹¹ Hyatt (1980: 165); and Sarna (1991: 80, 248 n. 47): 'the celestials'.

²⁹² Particularly, Egyptian deities: S.R. Driver (1911: 136); Cassuto (1967: 176).

²⁹³ The phraseology is echoed in the psalms: 35.10; 71.19; 77.14; 89.7-9; 113.5; also, in Isa 40.18, 25; and Mic 7.18.

אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים בָּא אֵלַי וּמְרֹאֵהוּ כְּמֹרֵאָה מְלֹאךְ הָאֱלֹהִים נֹרָא מְאֹד

וְלֹא שָׁאַלְתִּיהוּ אִי מִזֶּה הוּא וְאֵת שְׁמוֹ לֹא הִגִּיד לִי

The man of God came to me; and his appearance *was* like the appearance of the messenger of God, very frightening; and I did not ask him where he *was* from and he did not declare his name²⁹⁴ to me.

The term אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים is used elsewhere to indicate Yahweh's prophets²⁹⁵. Thus it suggests that she had not realised that he was the divine agent, but only that he was one of the prophets (cf. Judg 13.10, 16)²⁹⁶. However, the אִישׁ may suggest that the divine agent is perceived as having a human form²⁹⁷. According to Gen 1.26a, a human was created in the image of gods (Yahweh and his lesser deities)²⁹⁸. In other words, it can be said that the divine agent bears a resemblance to a mortal²⁹⁹.

Yet, whilst his manifestation was compared with that of a divine messenger (מְלֹאךְ), it was acknowledged to be exceedingly dreadful. The נֹרָא is used often to describe an attribute of Yahweh (Exod 15.11; Deut 7.21; 10.17;

²⁹⁴ This divine agent is known to be anonymous for his name is 'wonderful' (פְּלִיאָה) (v. 18), whilst Yahweh's name is explained and revealed (Exod 3.13-5; Deut 6.4; Jer 23.6, etc.). The reason for this hiding of the name is difficult to explain. The usage of Heb. פְּלִיאָה as an explanation of the name in the text echoes the praise to Yahweh in Exod 15.11, describing עֲשָׂה פְּלִאָה, 'doing a wonder': cf. the textual analysis above. The divine theophany or activity is discerned to be 'wonderful'. Also, see Prov 30.4, which presents a mysterious name of Yahweh's son gods: וּמָה שֵׁם בָּנָיו, lit., 'and what is the name of his sons?' The last term is better read as בָּנָיו, 'his sons', restored after LXX, whilst MT takes it as בֶּנִי, 'his son'. Yahweh's lesser deities are acknowledged here as his sons.

²⁹⁵ 1 Sam 2.27; 9.6, 7, 8, 10; 1 Kgs 12.22; 13.1 ff.; and 20.28, etc. Cf. Moore (1895: 317).

²⁹⁶ Soggin (1981: 234).

²⁹⁷ In the Babylonian wisdom literature, lesser deities appear as young men: *iš-ta-nu eṭ-lu*, 'a remarkable young man' (Lambert, 1960: 49), is sent as a divine messenger: see *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi* iii 9, 23.

²⁹⁸ See its textual analysis in Chapter I.

²⁹⁹ The anthropomorphic appearance of the divine agent is mentioned also elsewhere in Gen 18.1-2, 16; 19.1, 5; 32.24-32; Dan 8.15; and 10.5, 18.

28.58; Ps 47.3; and Dan 9.4) and of holy places, where Yahweh's presence is revealed (Gen 28.17); it is now employed to portray the appearance of Yahweh's messenger³⁰⁰. It may here represent the sender's presence with majesty.

2.2. Ecclesiastes 10.20b

Qoheleth describes a divine agent as being winged:

כי עוף השמים יוליך את הקול	For the bird of the heavens
	will carry ³⁰¹ the voice;
ובעל הכנפים יגיד דבר	and the possessor of the
	wings will declare the word.

The *עוף השמים*, 'a bird of the heavens', may be a metaphorical or symbolic expression of a heavenly agent in a winged form. In the following passage, the *בעל הכנפים*, 'a possessor of the wings' (reading as the Ketib), clarifies the identification of a divine agent who is charged with delivering the *λόγος*. It may describe the flying function of a celestial messenger. Thus, Targum reads *מלאכא* at this point.

The paralleled phrase of the *בעל הכנפים* is found in the Ugaritic ritual lists (KTU 1.46.6): *bʿl knp*, 'possessor of wings/winged one', or 'winged Baal' (*bʿl* as a DN). In any case, it denotes a winged deity. In regard to this, the *בעל הכנפים* points to a winged appearance of a divine agent.

Summary

The outward appearance of lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible is suggested as in human form; sc. anthropomorphic (Judg 13.6). Yet in some biblical descriptions, they are recounted also as being winged, which indicates their

³⁰⁰ See Niehaus (1995: 240-3).

³⁰¹ The H. form of the *הלך*, to 'go, walk': HALOT 246-8; thus, lit., 'cause (the voice) to go'.

flying function (Eccl 10.20b) like the Ugaritic lesser deities. Unlike the Ugaritic mythical descriptions, however, the biblical references do not present any horned image of the lesser deities.

Conclusion to Chapter II

As the Ugaritic titles of the lesser deities indicate their kinship to their master god(dess), so some mythological Hebrew terms designate the same conception. The kinship relation of lesser deities is attested in various Hebrew terms and in some biblical texts; especially in **אלם** and **בני (ה)אלהים**. Their 'holy' attribute inherited from their father god is found explicitly in the term **קדשים**, which is also evident of their kinship. Therefore, both the Hebrew and the Ugaritic corpuses inform us that the lesser deities are described as sons of their supreme god.

Whilst the Ugaritic lesser deities are suggested as being horned and winged in their form, the Hebrew lesser deities also appear as winged. Unlike that of the Ugaritic lesser deities, however, their appearance is represented mostly as anthropomorphic in the Hebrew Bible.

CHAPTER THREE:

Messenger Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible

Introduction

This chapter will observe the role of the lesser deities as divine messengers, charged by their master god, in both the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible. The roles of the lesser deities in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible can be arranged broadly as messengers, warriors, and others such as mediators, guardians, chanters, or servants¹. Among them, the 'messenger' role is taken as one of the primary tasks of their mission in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible.

This chapter will scrutinise any significant Ugaritic or Hebrew terms that denote divine 'messengers'². Some Ugaritic or Hebrew texts relevant to this issue will be selected and evaluated by a philological and textual analysis³.

¹ The exploration of the various roles of lesser deities will be extended to the following chapters: warrior deities (IV); mediator deities; guardian deities; chanter deities; or servant deities (V).

² Any Ugaritic terms which indicate 'messenger deities' in the Ugaritic texts will be examined in Part I of the chapter: thus, *mlak*; *glm*; *'nn*; *dll*; *'dd*; and *t'dt*. Heb. מלאך will be also investigated in Part II.

³ Some Ugaritic texts will be studied with the issue in Part I of the chapter: KTU 1.4 viii 14-17, etc. Also, some selected biblical Hebrew texts will be explored in Part II: 1 Kgs 22.22b; Ps 78.49; Exod 3.2; Exod 14.19; Judg 6.11-24; Judg 13.20a; and Ps 104.4.

In this part, the research will explore some Ugaritic terms for messenger deities and their different functions in the Ugaritic texts. The identity of Gupan and Ugar as the named messenger deities will be considered. Consequently, the procedure of 'messenger' dispatch will be studied in the Ugaritic texts. And finally, the 'messenger' theophany will be examined in the Ugaritic Texts.

1. The Ugaritic Titles of Messenger Deities

The varying modes of terminology for messenger deities in the Ugaritic texts point not only to a diversity of functions performed by them, but also to their nature and rank. Whilst a range of titles is supplied, each of them contains a functionally different meaning. Thus, divine messengers have three diverse aspects in their identification, through hierarchical (*glm*, *mlak*), cultic (*ʿnn ilm*), or political (*dll*, *ʿdd*, or *tʿdt*) definitions.

These titles are used interchangeably for the same messenger deities. Thus, when Baal's two messenger 'gods' (*ilm*)⁴ are sent to Anat, they are variously named as *glm(m)*⁵, *ʿnn ilm*⁶, *dll*⁷, or *ʿdd*⁸.

⁴ KTU 1.3 iii 32: sc. Gupan and Ugar. Cf. KTU 1.5 i 9 and 1.5 ii 13: as messengers between Mot and Baal they are called *ilm*.

⁵ KTU 1.3 iv 5; 1.3 v 15 (in El's speech); and 1.4 v 43 (in the editorial note).

⁶ KTU 1.3 iv 32; and 1.4 viii 15.

⁷ KTU 1.4 vii 45.

⁸ KTU 1.4 vii 46. The terms *dll* and *ʿdd* occur only to indicate the messengers of Baal.

1.1. Hierarchical Titles

1.1.1. *mlak* 'Messenger'

Ug. *mlak* is a generic title for any god who plays a 'messenger' role serving his master god. With a prefixed *-m*, it becomes a form of the 'agent noun' (*maqtal*)⁹ of the verbal root *lʔk*, to 'send'¹⁰, which refers also to the delivering of a message (*spr d likt*, 'a tablet that I sent'¹¹) or to the sending of messengers (*mlakm ylak ym*, 'Yam sent messengers'¹²).

Through the occurrence of cognates to Ug. *mlak* in the main Semitic languages¹³, it may be confirmed that it is etymologically a basic Semitic term

⁹ Huehnergard (1987: 82, 91); cf. Meier (1999: 45).

¹⁰ G.R. Driver (1956: 158); *UT* §19.1344; *WUS* no. 1432; del Olmo (1984b: 99); and *DUL* 486-7. Cf. its cognates, Ar. *laʔaka* (Hava, 1964: 673; von Rad, 1964: 76) and Eth. *laʔaka* (Leslau, 1987: 303).

¹¹ KTU 2.14.7.

¹² KTU 1.2 i 11. Cf. KTU 1.4 v 41; 1.14 iii 19; 2.33.36; and also cf. KTU 1.24.16: *ylak yrḥ*, 'Yarih sent ...'; there is no indication of 'messenger' (*mlak*), nor of 'tablet' (*spr*), nor of 'message' (*ṭhm*) at this place.

¹³ They are attested in Aram., Heb., Ph. *mlʔk* (*HALOT* 585-6; *DNWSI* 629), Ar. *malʔak* (*AEL* 3007, 3023), and Eth. *mlʔk* (Leslau, 1987: 303), etc. In Akkadian literature, the evidence for a divine messenger is uncertain. Yet, Akk. *mā laku* (*CAD* 10/1[M] 159) may show a possible reference to a messenger: PN *mā laku aṭṭardakku šipātīm mala tīšū ... ṭurdam*, 'I am sending you PN, my messenger; send me all the wool you have' (*CT* 29 21.19). In this case Akk. *mā laku* refers to a human 'messenger'. Akk. *mā laku* is a West Semitic loanword: *CDA* 193 (II). Akk. *ālikum*, a substantivised participle, is used to denote a 'traveller' or 'messenger' as an agent noun: cf. Huehnergard (2000: 197). The noun phrase *mār(i) šiprim* indicates also 'messenger': cf. Cunchillos (1982: 157-60). This phrase means literally 'son of a mission'. Akk. *mār(i)* is here bound with the genitive noun *šiprim*, which means 'sending, mission, or message', derived from the verbal form *šapārum*, 'to send'. The plural expression of this phrase, sc. 'messengers', is made by pluralizing the first term: *mārū šiprim* or *mār šiprī* (*mārī šiprim* for cases of gen.-acc.). The plural marker, however, appears irregularly at the end of the term as the gen.-acc. form; cf. Huehnergard (*ibid.*: 101; see 'Compound Noun Phrases'):

mār šiprī ana ālim ikšudū

the messengers arrived in the town.

mār šiprīšu ul āmur

I did not see his messenger(s).

with the sense of the 'agent' of the master one: sc. 'messenger'¹⁴. Thus, it can be suggested that the denotation of Ug. *mlak* and its cognates represent a hierarchical rank of messenger deities, subordinated to their master god¹⁵.

1.1.2. *glm*

1.1.2.1. 'Lad'

Ug. *glm* basically means 'youth'¹⁶. With this sense, it can be translated as 'lad'¹⁷. In the Ugaritic texts, the *glm(m)* refers to the agent deities of Baal¹⁸, Yam¹⁹ (sc. the *mlak(m) ym*), Mot²⁰, or the goddess Athirat²¹.²² It may have been used for their rank or scale, compared with their master god. Thus, it implies a 'lesser god' who plays a 'messenger' role for communication between their

¹⁴ Yamashita (1975: 57); Cunchillos (1982); and *DUL* 546. For further etymological study on Ug. *mlak*, and its $\sqrt{l^2k}$, see Cunchillos (1981a: 32-39); and for the semantic development of the term, see Greenstein (1979: 329-36).

¹⁵ Whilst Ug. *mlak* is used to indicate a divine 'messenger' (sc. Yam's 'messengers', distinctively at KTU 1.2 i 11, 22, 26, 28, 30, 41, 42 and 44), it occurs also to denote a mortal 'messenger'; thus, in the Keret Epic, human messengers play their roles in the exchange between Keret and King Pabil of Udum (KTU 1.14 iii 19 f.; 1.14 iv 32 f.; and 1.14 vi 35). They act in the descriptions as political messengers.

¹⁶ *UT* §19.1969; *WUS* no. 2150; Xella (1981: 29-30); Wyatt (2002: 58 n. 99; cf. 417 n. 9 and 447 n. 30); and *DUL* 319-20. Cf. Heb. מַלְאִים: *HALOT* 835; Aram. *ḡlym*: *DNWSI* 854-5; Ar. *ḡulām*: *AEL* 2286-7; Al-Yasin (1952: no. 473).

¹⁷ Oldenburg (1969: 191).

¹⁸ Sc. 'Gupan and Ugar' (messenger deities): KTU 1.3 iii 8; 1.3 iv 5; 1.3 v 15; 1.4 v 43; 1.4 vii 52-3; 1.8 ii 5; and 1.10 ii 3; and 'seven Lads': KTU 1.5 v 9 (|| *hnr[m]*).

¹⁹ KTU 1.2 i 13, 19, and 39.

²⁰ KTU 1.6 vi 8.

²¹ KTU 1.4 ii 29.

²² Whilst other occurrences elsewhere have explicit references to divine or royal figures, it is not clear whether the term *glmm* at KTU 1.19 ii 28, when two messengers arrive with the news of Aqhat's death, indicates human or divine beings; whilst Jirku (1962: 131 n. 6) questions whether they are divine messengers, Pardee (1997: 352 and n. 103) supposes that they are messengers of Mot. Although it remains a problematic discussion (Wyatt, 2002: 58 n. 99), with some implications in the context, they are probably human messengers.

master god and other gods. Therefore, it can be defined as a hierarchical designation for the lesser deities serving other higher deities.

1.1.2.2. 'Heir'

The term is used in some instances of mortals: Keret is called *glm il*²³, which is translated in a 'theological or ideological nuance' as a 'Heir of El'²⁴. Yasib, Keret's heir, is called also *glm*²⁵.

It has been translated also as 'servant'²⁶. Mowinckel related the phrase with Keret's other epithet, the *'bd il*²⁷, 'servant of El'²⁸. But it seems that three designations, *bn(m) il*²⁹, *glm il*, and *'bd il*, are used interchangeably in the *Keret epic* to indicate the theological or ideological identity of Keret. With all implications from the context of the texts, the *glm il* is best taken as his royal designation.

1.1.2.3. 'Goddess' or 'Bride'

Its feminine form, *glmt*, generally refers to a 'goddess'³⁰ in the mythological sense in the Ugaritic texts. It may be construed as a 'bride' in royal

²³ KTU 1.14 i 40-1; 1.14 ii 8-9; and 1.15 ii 20.

²⁴ Wyatt (2002: 184 and n. 32).

²⁵ KTU 1.14 iii 49 and 1.14 vi 34.

²⁶ Cf. G.R. Driver (1956: 29): 'servitor'; Gray (1964a: 35): 'servant or worshipper'; and Gibson (1978: 83): 'page'.

²⁷ KTU 1.14 iii 49, 51; and 1.14 vi 34-5.

²⁸ Mowinckel (1942: 24-6) interestingly suggested that it may be connected, in a royal-divine ideology, to the 'Servant' passages in Deutero-Isaiah. This idea has been developed by Engnell (1948: 54-93).

²⁹ KTU 1.16 i 10, 20; and 1.16 ii 48.

³⁰ KTU 1.24.7; 1.39.19; and 1.41.25 (= 1.87.27): sc. Nikkal. For other occurrences, cf. KTU 1.119.8; 1.123.19; 1.139.10; and 1.148.34.

references³¹. Meantime, it is suggested to connote a 'pregnant woman' like Heb. עלמה at Isa 7.14³².

1.1.2.4. 'Agent god'

In the case at KTU 1.119.7, Ug. *glm* (m. sg.) seems to indicate not an ordinary lesser god, but a special god³³; thus, the text runs:

<i>gdlt l glm</i>	a heifer ³⁴ to the Agent god;
<i>dqtm w g<d>lt l glmtm</i>	Two ewes ³⁵ and a h<ei>fer to the
	Agent goddesses

(KTU 1.119.7-8).

In the more mythological nuance with the ritual contexts, the *glm* can be identified as an 'agent god' who may have been seen to interact between mortals and his master god, perhaps as a messenger god. Herdner proposes

³¹ Whilst it has been translated as 'girl' (Gordon, 1965: §19.1969), it is more properly read as 'bride' in the royal wedding contexts (sc. Hurriy, Keret's queen: KTU 1.14 iv 41; 1.15 ii 22); thus, Wyatt (2002: 201, 9): the 'sacred bride'. Also in a divine instance, it clearly occurs in the case of the goddess Nikkal as a bride (KTU 1.24.7).

³² Since Vawter (1952: 319-22), Gordon (1953: 106), and Lacheman (1954: 43) have recognised the semantic relevance between Ug. *glmt* and its Hebrew cognate עלמה, Wyatt (1985a: 45, and cf. 52 n. 29; 2002: 58 n. 99) has developed this idea, saying that Ug. *glmt* is analogous to Heb. עלמה at Isa 7.14, which is used to denote, probably, "Ahaz's pregnant queen Hepzibah, who is carrying Hezekiah": thus, the text of KTU 1.24.7, *hl glmt tld bn*, 'Lo, the sacred bride bore a son' (Wyatt, 2002: 337), is related ideologically to the Hebrew text of Isa 7.14, וילדה בן, 'Lo, a young woman (or a bride) is with a child and shall bear a son': cf. Wyatt (1994a: 146-7; 1996: 4 n. 8). De Tarragon (1989: 207 n. 191) confirms the Semitic equivalence between two terms.

³³ Wyatt (2002: 417 n. 9), after consideration, comments that it represents a "specific god, not a generic term"; thus, in capitals, the 'Divine Assistant'.

³⁴ Ug. *gdlt*, 'cattle, cow (for sacrifice)', is derived from the \sqrt{gdl} , 'broad, wide, large': UT §19.562; DUL 294-5; and cf. 'heifer': Wyatt (2002: 417). Differently, 'ripe (grain)': Watson (1999: 787). Cf. Heb. גרל: HALOT 179-80.

³⁵ Ug. *dqt*, '(sacrificial) ewe, sweep', is derived from the \sqrt{dq} , 'tiny, fine, weak': DUL 278-9. Cf. Heb. and Pun. *dq*: HALOT 229; DNWSI 257-8; Aram. *dqq*: DNWSI 258; Akk. *daqqu*: AHw 163; CAD 3[D] 107; Ar. *diqq*: AEL 806. It occurs here as a dual form to constitute a pair with *glmtm*.

that Ug. *glm* is probably an epithet of a young god³⁶. Following Herdner, de Tarragon takes it as 'Ghalmu'³⁷. On the other hand, de Moor interprets it as Baal³⁸.

Yet, the more plausible argument is Wyatt's proposal, which construes it as a 'god of the third rank, such as one of the messenger gods who appear in the myths (Yam's assistants, KTU 1.2 i 13-35, Baal's assistants [Gupan and Ugar], KTU 1.3 iii 8-32, iv 5-20; Athirat's [Qadesh-and-Amurr], KTU 1.3 vi 10-25)'; however, the precise identification of the god is not clear at this place³⁹.

In any event, Ug. *glm* can be suggested here as the divine epithet of the lesser deities. It may be attested in the PNs ([*bn*] *glm*, [*bn*] *glmy*, [*bn*] *glmn*, and *glmt*)^{40, 41}. Ug. *glm* in the PNs may be referred to as the epithet of one of the messenger gods addressed above, or possibly to a 'generic epithet' of specific agent deities functioning as "archangels"⁴².

Herdner leaves it an open question as to whether the *glm* and *glmtm*, in lines 7-8, denote the temple personnel⁴³. Xella relates Ug. *glmtm* (f. du.) to Ug. *bt* in the following terms *bt* *ṭy ydbḥ*⁴⁴: thus, '... for the two *glmt* of the temple'⁴⁵. Yet Ug. *bt* seems to be more convincingly associated to Ug. *ṭy*, which constitutes a phrase to modify the main verb *ydbḥ*. The two terms seem to indicate 'divine recipients' of sacrificial offerings given by human

³⁶ Herdner (1978 : 32): 'Peut-être *glm* est-il l'épithète d'un dieu jeune'.

³⁷ De Tarragon (1989: 207 and n. 191).

³⁸ De Moor (1987: 162 and n. 46, 172).

³⁹ Wyatt (2002: 417-8 n. 9).

⁴⁰ Cf. *UT* §19.1969 and 512.

⁴¹ Thus, Wyatt (1985a: 52 n. 29) remarks that in these occurrences of PNs, the 'element can only seriously have a divine or cultic reference'.

⁴² Thus, a PN may denote, perhaps, a 'son of the agent god' as the "archangel" or "guardian deity".

⁴³ Herdner (1978: 32).

⁴⁴ '(In) the house of the priest he will sacrifice'. The reading of *bt* may be a haplography for *bbt*.

⁴⁵ Xella (1981: 26): 'per le (due) *glmt* del tempio'.

worshippers in the ritual places at Ugarit, like El and (seven) Baals in the previous line (1.119.6). Wyatt assumes that the *glm̄tm* are ‘avatars of Athirat and Rahmay, who appear as El’s brides in KTU 1.23’⁴⁶. But it seems more probable they are to indicate the epithet of the agent goddesses.

1.1.2.5. ‘Small One’

In other cases, its feminine form *glm̄t* is sometimes problematic in its translation, whether it denotes the ‘messengers’ or the ‘epithet’ of a god:

<i>gm̄ l ḡ[l]mh bʿl k yṣḥ</i>	Aloud ⁴⁷ to his Lads Baal surely exclaims:
<i>ʿn [gpn] w ugr</i>	‘Look, [Gupan] and Ugar,
<i>b<n>glm̄t [ʿmm] ym</i>	the Small One ⁴⁸ [has darkened ⁴⁹] the
	day;
<i>bn ḡlm̄t r[mt prʿ]t</i>	the Gloomy One (has darkened) the
	Ex[alted Prince]ss ⁵⁰

(KTU 1.4 vii 52-56).

⁴⁶ Cf. ‘the Sacred Brides’: Wyatt (2002: 418 and n. 10).

⁴⁷ Ug. *g*, ‘(loud) voice, shout’: DUL 290. It functions as an adverb here, with the enclitic *-m*.

⁴⁸ CTA reads it as *b<n> glm̄t*; followed by KTU^{land2}. The reading of *bn glm̄t* is preferred at this place rather than *bglm̄t* because it gives a better understanding and is supposed by its paralleled phrase in the next line. The error is explained as haplography because we see its parallel as the correction at KTU 1.8.7: *bn glm̄t*.

⁴⁹ It is restored from its paralleled line, KTU 1.8.8. Ug. *ʿmm*, to ‘be covered, dark’: del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 164). Cf. Heb. עָנַם: HALOT 846; Arab. *gamma*: AEL 2289-91. The translation follows here Wyatt’s suggestion (2002: 111). Differently, del Olmo-Sanmartín (*ibid.*) take it as a Gpass., interpreting as ‘the sea is covered (?) in darkness’. Cf. Margalit (1980: 68): ‘turban’.

⁵⁰ It is restored from KTU 1.8.9. Ug. *rm*, to ‘go up, get up, erect, raise’; as an adj., to ‘be high, sublime, exalted’: del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 740-1; *rm* and [1]). Cf. Heb. רָם: HALOT 1202-5. Ug. *prʿt*, ‘princess’: Gibson (1978: 66, 156); de Moor (1987: 65); de Moor-Spronk (1987: 164). Cf. Heb. פָּרַע: HALOT 970-1. Differently, (the Exalted) ‘Sovereign’: de Moor (1971: 164, 172), followed by Wyatt (2002: 112 and n. 173); ‘high, lofty’: del Olmo-Sanmartín (*ibid.*: 679), referring to Arab. *fāriʿat*: AEL 2380; ‘mane’: Margalit (1980: 72). It denotes perhaps Shapsh: Wyatt (2002: 112 n. 172).

The *b<n> ġlmt* has been regarded as Gupan and Ugar. Gordon has construed the phrase as the 'son(s) of (the goddess) Ġalmat', as an exceptional case in which they are indicated as a 'single god of the A-and-B' for the reading of the *b<n> ġlmt* as *bin* (sg.) + *ġalmat*⁵¹. Whilst de Moor read it as 'the sons of Concealment', which indicates 'Gupan and Ugar'⁵², Margalit translated it as 's<ons> of the maiden'⁵³.

On the other hand, Wyatt suggests it as the parallel epithet of Mot; as the *b<n> ġlmt* is paralleled with the *bn ʒlmt* in line 55, it may mean 'son of darkness ... son of gloom' (sc. 'the Dark One... the Gloomy One'); he argues that the 'Dark One' (Heb. *šalmāwet*) is a possible suggestion for the *bn ġlmt* in both KTU 1.4 vii 54 and 1.8.7 since each of the titles contains the element *mt* as a word-play for the DN Mot⁵⁴. Yet it may refer rather to Mot in a scornful sense of his youth; thus, the 'Small One' ... the 'Gloomy One', for Baal is boasting of his ability of ruling over the cosmos in the previous text (KTU 1.4 vii 49-52).

In KTU 1.169.10, Ug. *ġlm* has been suggested also as an epithet of Horon⁵⁵ or a name of Baal⁵⁶. Yet it would be better to see it as the indication of a special agent god⁵⁷, as at KTU 1.119.7 above:

ygrš ḥrn ḥbrm May Horon⁵⁸ expel⁵⁹ (your) Binders⁶⁰,

⁵¹ Gordon (1965: 19.1969; also cf. 1977: 101-2).

⁵² De Moor (1971: 164). Caquot-Sznycer (1974: 219 and n. w.) also see it as the titles of Gupan and Ugar.

⁵³ Margalit (1980: 68).

⁵⁴ Wyatt (2002: 111-2 and n. 171).

⁵⁵ Caquot (1978-9: 489), referring it to the 'youth'. Bordreuil-Caquot (1980: 348) view that Ug. *ḥrn* and *ġlm* occur here as a pair; thus, Ug. *ġlm* represents here Horon's youth. De Moor (1980c: 432) construes it also as an epithet of Horon.

⁵⁶ De Moor (1987: 185 n. 21).

⁵⁷ Thus, Wyatt (2002: 447) translates it as 'Divine Assistant'.

⁵⁸ Horon is regarded as a chthonian deity: cf. Albright (1936: 9); Pope-Röllig (1965a: 288-9); and Rütterswörden (1999: 425-6).

w *glm d'ṭm*

and (may) the Agent god (expel your)
acquaintances⁶¹

(KTU 1.169.9-10).

If it is, this agent god may have been deemed, possibly, to function as a divine warrior to fight the demonic spirits. Since Horon is evoked here against the demons, the *glm* may be construed as his agent deity, or probably as one of Baal's agent (perhaps, warrior) deities⁶². At any rate, it is seen as the lesser deity. As seen so far, the identity of the *glm* or *glmt* must be defined in the context of each text.

1.2. Cultic/Theophanic Title: *ṣnn*

1.2.1. Divine 'Cloud'

Ug. *ṣnn* denotes basically 'cloud'⁶³:

[*h/i b'glm d iph*[xx]

[] O Baal of the mist⁶⁴,

[il] *hdd ṣnn n*[x]

[Divine] Hadd of the clouds⁶⁵

⁵⁹ Ug. *grš*, to 'eject, drive out, cast out': DUL 309. Cf. Heb. גרש: HALOT 204. De Moor (1987: 185) refers the verb to the *kšpm*, 'sorcerers', and *dbbm*, 'demons', as a passive meaning: 'Let ... be chased away'. But it is better translated here in a jussive mood, as Wyatt (2002: 447) suggests.

⁶⁰ Ug. *hbr*; cf. Heb. חבר: HALOT 288; Akk. *ilebru*: AHw 363-4; CAD 7[I/J] 5-7; 'binder': Avishur (1981: 16). Differently, 'companion': de Moor (1987: 185); Caquot (1989: 115 n. 353); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 353 [I]); 'familiar': Wyatt (2002: 447 and n. 29); 'charmer, enchanter': Dijkstra (1985: 149-50 and n. 29).

⁶¹ Ug. *d'ṭ*, 'knowledge, information, friendship, or acquaintance, mate, as an "abstract for concrete"': DUL 259-60; derived from the Ug. *√yd'*, to 'know'. Cf. Heb. דעת: HALOT 228-9; Pun. *d'ṭ*: DNWSI 440; and Akk. *di'ātu*: AHw 168; CAD 3[D] 130-1.

⁶² One of Baal's seven lads (?): *šb'ṭ glmh* (KTU 1.5 v 8-9).

⁶³ See n. 68 below.

⁶⁴ Ug. *iph*; possibly related to Akk. *upû*, 'mist, cloud': Gibson (1978: 142); Walls (1992: 131); Lloyd (1994: 262); and Wyatt (2004: 158 and n. 13), suggesting a possible reading as '*ipi* (gen.)'. Cf. de Moor (1987: 113): 'drizzle'.

⁶⁵ At this place, 'clouds': Gaster (1939: 276); G.R. Driver (1956: 117; 141); Lipiński (1965: 219); van Zijl (1972: 22); de Moor (1987: 113); and Renfroe (1992: 23).

In this fragment of the epics the poetic structure has a semantic parallel of two noun phrases; thus, *iph* of Baal is a parallel to *ʿnn* of Hadd⁶⁷. Unfortunately the passage is largely broken after the line. But it can reasonably be inferred that the two terms, *iph* and *ʿnn*, in the phrases express the theophanic characteristics of Baal/Hadd.

With this sense Ug. *ʿnn* is used, with the term *ilm*, to express an aspect of the theophanic emanation of messenger gods, or to substitute for their names as an epithet. Thus, it is used as a semantic equivalent to divine 'messengers' in the Ugaritic texts: *ʿnn*, 'Clouds'⁶⁸; *ʿnn ilm*, 'divine Clouds'⁶⁹; and *ʿnnh*, 'his Clouds'⁷⁰. In the Baal Cycle this phrase is used as a linguistic

⁶⁶ The translation follows Wyatt (2002: 158). Differently, de Moor (1987: 113): '... who [] the drizzle; ... who [] the clouds!'.

⁶⁷ The alternative name of Baal: Sanmartín (1991: 188); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 334-5).

⁶⁸ KTU 1.4 iv 59. It is referred, most plausibly, to Heb. *ענן*: BDB 777-8; HALOT 857-8; thus, 'Cloud' (deity): Mann (1971: 21-2; 1977: 96); van Zijl (1972: 22); Clifford (1972: 112, 125); and Wyatt (1992a: 422), whilst its etymological root has been variously proposed: as $\sqrt{c_{nw/y}}$, to 'be poor, afflicted, humble' (Gaster, 1934: 695; cf. 1935: 27-8 n. 112; i.e., 'servitor/ministrant'); followed by Aistleitner (1939: 203); and Good (1978: 436-7), interpreting the second *n* of Ug. *ʿnn* as a nominal suffix; thus, 'one characterized by submission' (i.e., 'servant'); or, as relating to Arab. *ʿanna*, to 'present oneself, intervene' (AEL 2162-7): Cassuto (1971: 137, 167 [i.e., 'representatives']); G.R. Driver (1956: 79, 89, 97 [i.e., 'lackey'], 141 and n. 22); Kaiser (1962: 60 n. 242), Oldenburg (1969: 192 [i.e., 'devotee'] and n. 3); and van Zijl (1972: 22, 103-4 and n. 9); or, as relating to Heb. *ענן*, 'practice soothsaying' (BDB 778; HALOT 857): Rin (1968: 55); or, as relating to Arab. *ʿawn*, 'help' (AEL 2203-4): de Moor (1971: 129-30) construes it as a noun form of the *qtl* with the suffix *-n*; followed by Renfroe (1992: 24): to 'designate the agent of "help, assistance," i.e. "helper, assistant"'. Cf. 'servant, attendant': Ginsberg (1944: 27 n. 8; 1969: 133, 137); Habel (1964: 52); 'partisan, lackey': Gordon (1949: 13, 32); 'messenger': Aistleitner (1964: 33, 49; 1974: no. 2061a); or, 'helper, herald': del Olmo (1981: 602). For other opinions, see de Moor (1971: 129-30); van Zijl (1972: 22, 102-4).

⁶⁹ KTU 1.1 iii [17]; 1.3 iv 32 and 1.4 viii 15. Or, it could be construed as 'Clouds of the god' (as *-m* enclitic). Cf. Wyatt (1992a: 422).

⁷⁰ KTU 1.2 i [18] and 35.

surrogate for the characteristic or the name of the messengers of El (KTU 1.1 iii 17) or Baal (KTU 1.4 viii 15)⁷¹.

With a citation of KTU 1.4 viii 14-7, Mendenhall argues that it is a surrogate for the name of Baal⁷². 'Clouds' are sometimes used as an epithet, which expresses the theophanic character of a god. In the text, however, the phrase *ʿnn ilm* indicates not Baal himself, but the messengers of Baal. Baal instructs his two messengers, Gupan and Ugar, before sending them to Mot, the god of the underworld:

<i>w ngr ʿnn ilm</i>	But pay attention, Clouds ⁷³ of the god ⁷⁴ ,
<i>al tqrb l bn ilm mt</i>	do not approach to the divine Mot

(KTU 1.4 viii 14-17).

This is a part of the instruction of Baal to his messengers, Gupan and Ugar, before he sends them to Mot, the ruler of the underworld (KTU 1.4 vii 53 ff.). Ug. *ngr*, which has a frequent meaning of to 'guard', is used here as an imperative form; with regard to the passage of KTU 1.4 viii 14-21, divine messengers are believed to be vulnerable.

It is not certain, however, whether the same phrase *ʿnn ilm* is intended also to indicate the messengers of El due to the fragmentation of the tablets.

⁷¹ Gibson (1978: 154) proposes two different etymological roots for Ug. *ʿnn*: thus, one for 'attendant, lackey' and the other for 'cloud'. However, these are not derived from different roots. Its basic meaning, 'cloud', may be applied metaphorically to another usage for denoting a 'agent deity'.

⁷² Mendenhall (1973: 55).

⁷³ Whilst Wyatt (1992a: 422) translates this term as 'Cloud(s)', others take it variously in the text: 'servants' (Caquot-Szyncer, 1974: 220; M.S. Smith, 1997: 139); 'lackeys' (Gibson, 1978: 66); 'heralds': (del Olmo, 1981: 211); or 'attendants' (de Moor, 1987: 67; Wyatt, 2002: 113).

⁷⁴ Or, 'divine Clouds'. Mendenhall (1973: 55) leaves it untranslated: 'Beware, O *ʿnn* of the gods'. Differently, cf. Ginsberg (1944: 28): the 'Godly One', whose name follows Mot, and which denotes a 'single' deity. Yet, the phrase *ʿnn ilm* indicates 'Gupan and Ugar' in the context of the texts; thus it denotes 'two' gods.

Some evidence may be suggested only in the reconstructed line of KTU 1.1 iii 17:

w y^{ʿn} ktr w ḥss

And Kothar-and-Hasis replied

[lk lk ^{ʿnn} ilm]

‘Go, go! Clouds of the god!’.

KTU² reads the lacuna after ḥss as lk lk ^{ʿnn} ilm on the basis of KTU 1.3 iv 32-33. The messengers of El may be called ^{ʿnn} ilm at this place. These messengers travel to Anat (KTU 1.1 ii 13 ff.), and then to Kothar-and-Hasis (KTU 1.1 iii 1 ff.) to convey the messages of El. The identity of the messenger deities is not clear in the text. De Moor’s identification of these deities as Qadesh-and-Amurr⁷⁵ is not supported by any evidence because of the brokenness of the tablet.

Wyatt points out that Ug. ^{ʿnn} occurs with a weather-god. His explanation of Ug. ^{ʿnn} seems plausible. He writes: “The clouds are to be seen now as companions, now as a vehicle for the god. The very chariot is animate and divine”⁷⁶.

1.2.2. Divine ‘Labourer’

Ug. ^{ʿnn} appears to denote an assistant deity of Athirat. It is attested in the following description where El replies to Athirat:

p ^{ʿbd} an ^{ʿnn} atrt

Am I a servant⁷⁷, a Cloud⁷⁸ of Athirat?

⁷⁵ De Moor (1987: 21) construes that El’s messengers are a single messenger (sc. ‘Qadesh-and-Amurr’); also, Caquot-Szzyner (1974: 301-3). Others take them to be two: del Olmo (1981: 163); M.S. Smith (1994: 196-201).

⁷⁶ Wyatt (1992a: 422).

⁷⁷ Ug. ^{ʿbd}, ‘servant, slave’: DUL 139-41. Cf. Heb. עֶבֶד: HALOT 774-5; Ph., Pun., Aram. ^{ʿbd}: DNWSI 816-9; Akk. AHw 6; CAD 1/1[A] 51; Albright (1968b: 122 n. 30); Ginsberg (1969: 133); and Watson (1984: 151).

⁷⁸ De Moor (1971: 129) says that the ^{ʿbd} and the ^{ʿnn} are set as a parallel. Differently, Albright (1968b: 122 n. 30) argues that the root of the term ^{ʿnn} is connected to the Canaanite term ^{ʿanni} or ^{ʿanini} of reciting to music and Heb. ^{ʿōnēn}, to ‘recite charms’; thus, ‘play-boy’; but, it should be taken as a meaning paralleled with the ^{ʿbd}, ‘servant’, to grasp a mould for

p 'bd ank aḥd ult

Am I a servant to grasp a mould,

hm amt atrt tlbn lbnt

or a maidservant⁷⁹ of Athirat to
make bricks?

ybn bt l b' l km ilm

Let a house be built for Baal like (that
of) the gods,

w ḥzr k bn atrt

and a mansion like (that of) the sons
of Athirat!

(KTU 1.4 iv 59 - v 1).

The paralleled phrases are construed as a('bd):b('nn) of DN; a'('bd):b'(amt) of DN. Ug. 'bd is paralleled with the term 'nn, the first title of the assistant deity of Athirat; and then, the following line explains that the function of the 'bd is to 'grasp a mould'. Ug. amt, the second title of the assistant deity of Athirat, has as its function to 'make bricks'. In this paralleled construction, it is clear that amt of Athirat is a semantic equivalent to 'nn of Athirat. The construct phrase 'nn atrt implies the fact that the term 'nn can be employed to signify assistant deities of any other gods as well as Baal: Athirat or perhaps El. For this reason, Good argues that this term is not a meteorological theophanic indication related to the storm god⁸⁰.

Thus, the divinised 'cloud' ('nn) may be construed as having been derived metaphorically from the 'smoke' of an altar and the temple; as such, it may possibly have been used to indicate divine 'messengers' or 'labourers', associated with cultic imagery (sc. 'smoke'). Whilst the messengers of Yam appear as blazing figures, the messengers of Baal are described as smoky

the construction of a house. Also cf. 'magical appearance': van Zijl (1972: 98, 103-4); 'menial': Watson (1977: 284; 1984: 151).

⁷⁹ Thus, a maidservant like Dimgay (?): *dmgy amt atrt* (KTU 1.12 i 16-7; and cf. KTU 1.2 i 22-26). Further discussion of Ug. amt shall be made in the category of 'bd 'Servant' in Chapter V.

⁸⁰ Good (1978: 437).

figures. It may be inferred that the 'fire' and 'cloud' ('smoke') imply temple imagery (sc. 'fire' and 'smoke' around the altar).

In any event, Ug. *ʿnn* is used here to denote 'labour deities' for the temple operation. It is clear in the text that the functions of *ʿbd*, *ʿnn*, and *amt* are paralleled to signify a 'labour deity' to build a house. Therefore, in this case, the term *ʿnn* is regarded as a divine labourer making bricks⁸¹. It may have been implied that human workers were working for the Baal temple at Ugarit, but in the mythological texts these craftsmen were called *ʿnn*. Thus, de Moor points out that the *ʿnn* can be categorised as a 'low' group; perhaps as the 'lowest' class⁸².

1.2.3. 'Cloud' as a Poetical Metaphor

Ug. *ʿnn* is also used as a linguistic representative of the person⁸³:

[] *at brt lbk ʿnn* [] You are pure of heart (like) clouds of ...

(KTU 2.8.4).

If the term following Ug. *ʿnn* is to be any DN⁸⁴, the *ʿnn* can be construed as a 'lesser deity' of the DN⁸⁵. In this case, it may be regarded as a poetical metaphor to express the attribute of lesser deities. Ug. *brr*, the verbal root of

⁸¹ The Ugaritic texts describes that when Athirat has asked El to supply a house for Baal, El grumbled since such a construction duty belongs to lesser deities (KTU 1.4 iv 50-61). Thus, Good (1978: 437) explains that "El's declinatory question indicates the fulfillment of this requirement to be beneath the dignity of the head of the pantheon". Nevertheless, he reluctantly has let Baal have a house (KTU 1.4 iv 62 - v 1).

⁸² De Moor (1971: 129). Yet, de Moor (*ibid.*) seems to understand that Gupan and Ugar may be included in this group since the expression *ʿnn ilm* is used frequently to indicate these dual gods. The *ʿnn* at this place, however, appears as a singular form which is stressed to compare with El.

⁸³ Cf. Mendenhall (1973: 55).

⁸⁴ Perhaps, *il* or *bʿl*.

⁸⁵ It is doubtful that Ug. *bln*, 'white', follows after the term *ʿnn*; the expected phrase *ʿnn bln* is not found in the Ugaritic texts at all.

brt, applies the attribute of *ʿnn* as a metaphor. However, it is difficult to prove this because of the fragmentary nature of the tablets.

1.3. Political Titles

1.3.1. *dll* and *ʿdd*

The meaning of Ug. *dll* has been suggested as ‘guide’⁸⁶, on the basis of Ar. *dalīlu*, ‘broker’, or something similar rather than ‘tribute’⁸⁷ or ‘herald’⁸⁸. Alternatively, it may be related to Akk. *dayyālu/dajālu*, which means ‘scout, inspector’⁸⁹. In this sense, it may be rendered as ‘courier, messenger, or mediator’⁹⁰. Among them, it is best construed as ‘messenger’ in the unequivocal ‘messenger’ context; thus Ug. *dll* becomes the linguistic equivalent of Ug. *mlak*:

dll al ilak l bn ilm mt A messenger surely I (sc. Baal) will send
to divine Mot,
ʿdd l ydd il ġzr a herald⁹¹ (I will send) to the Beloved⁹² of
El, Hero⁹³

(KTU 1.4 vii 45-7).

⁸⁶ Albright (1933: 18 n. 48); G.R. Driver (1956: 154); de Moor (1971: 168); and del Olmo (1981: 536).

⁸⁷ Sanmartín (1980: 347); Margalit (1980: 69, 245).

⁸⁸ Jirku (1962: 52).

⁸⁹ *AHW* 150; *CAD* 3[D] 27-8. Cf. de Moor (1971: 168)

⁹⁰ Del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 270-1).

⁹¹ Ug. *ʿdd*, from the $\sqrt{ʿdd}$, to ‘declare, respond’: *DUL* 149 (cf. Ar. *ʿadda/ʿāda*: *AEL* 1969-72; 2188-92). Cf. Aram. *ʿdd*, ‘messenger, herald’: *DNWSI* 827-8. Thus, Gray (1965: 53-4 n. 3); Leslau (1966); de Moor (1971: 168); Renfroe (1992: 87); and cf. Wyatt (2002: 111): ‘envoy’.

⁹² Ug. *ydd*, ‘loved’, an adj. form of the \sqrt{ydd} : *DUL* 956. Cf. Heb. יָדִיד: *HALOT* 390. The *ydd il* occurs here as the epithet of Mot.

⁹³ Ug. *ġzr*, ‘youth, hero, warrior’: van Selms (1954: 95-6); Miller (1970a: 162-4); Lipiński (1970: 77); de Moor (1971: 76); *DUL* 329. Cf. Heb. גִּזְרִי: *HALOT* 811; Ar. *ġazīr*: *AEL* 2255.

The term *dll* contains a diplomatically nuanced explication at this point. It occurs in a parallel structure with another diplomatic term *‘dd* in the next line. It may be taken as the epithet for messenger deities.

1.3.2. *t‘dt*

In the Ugaritic texts, three terms are semantically equated with each other, indicating ‘messenger deities’, charged legitimately by their master god: *mlak(m)* (KTU 1.2 i 11, 22, 26, 28, 30, 41, 42, and 44), *glm* (KTU 1.2 i 13, 19, and 39), and *t‘dt* (KTU 1.2 i 22, 26, 28, 30, 41, and 44). All three designations refer to the ‘messenger deities’ of Yam. Thus, Ug. *t‘dt*, translated as ‘embassy’⁹⁴ in the ‘messenger’ texts, may express implicitly a legal guarantee given by the sender. The term in a sg. form, paralleled with the plural term *mlakm*, is construed here as an ‘abstract noun used as a collective’⁹⁵. Thus they are

⁹⁴ Ug. *t‘dt* is construed as a f. sg. noun form which is derived from the $\sqrt{\text{wd}}$, to ‘go round’, (de Moor, 1971: 130) or, more probably, to ‘witness’ (cf. Heb. עֵד: HALOT 795-6); thus, Gray (1965: 24; ‘witnesses’); Pardee (1978b: 206), suggesting that if Ug. *t‘dt* is construed as ‘messenger’, ‘it would be the literary term for “witness”’; and M.S. Smith (1994: 265, 282 and n. 103), referring it to Heb. עֵד, ‘testimony, witness’, proposes to translate it as ‘legation’ rather than ‘embassy’ since they are just ‘messengers’ (sc. lesser deities). Cf. Dahood (1979: 143-4). Even though the lesser deities are called the indications of *mlak(m)*, *glm*, or *t‘dt*, their eligible qualification as embassies shown in the pantheon, especially as war-messengers in the situation of divine conflicts (KTU 1.2 i 22-35), makes plausible its translation as ‘embassy’: Gibson (1978: 40); del Olmo (1981: 170); and Wyatt (2002: 57). Similarly, ‘envoy’: Ginsberg (1969: 130); de Moor (1987: 30); ‘ambassador’: van Selms (1970: 258 and cf. 252 n. 2); Caquot-Szzyr (1974: 128), relating Heb. חֲשׂוּדָה, ‘testimony, attestation’ (*ibid.*, n. g’), as its counterpart. Cf. Coogan (1978: 87): ‘mission’. Differently, from the $\sqrt{\text{w}^{\text{d}}}$, to ‘appoint’: G.R. Driver (1956: 152; ‘accredited messenger[s]’); Aistleitner (1974: no. 1195); Gray (*ibid.*, 187 n. 9; ‘associates, allies’); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 856); or, from *‘dd*: Gaster (1950: 447); also, cf. ‘council envoy’: Cross (1953: 274: n. 1) seems to relate the term to Ug. *‘dt*, ‘meeting, assembly’. For further discussion, see de Moor (1971: 130-1); and M.S. Smith (1994: 282 and n. 103, 4).

⁹⁵ Gray (1965: 24 n. 8); followed by de Moor (1971: 130). Cf. ‘abstract for concrete’: Gibson (1978: 159); M.S. Smith (1994: 282); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 856).

regarded as two messengers⁹⁶. In KTU 1.2 i, Yam's messengers are always introduced as his *t'dt*:

<i>hlm ilm tphhm</i>	Lo, the gods saw ⁹⁷ them,
<i>tphn mlak ym</i>	they saw the messengers of Yam,
<i>t'dt tpt[nhr]</i>	the embassy of Judge [Nahar]

(KTU 1.2 i 21-22).

The term *t'dt* is related only to the messengers of Yam in the Baal Cycle; the first phrase, *mlak ym*, is always paralleled with the second corresponding phrase, *t'dt tpt nhr* (KTU 1.2 i 26, 28, 30, 41, 44). Thus we may find that it is the official and legal designation of messengers as representatives.

Summary

Each Ugaritic title of messenger deities contains a different meaning in regard to their nature and rank. Although three major identifications of hierarchical (*glm*, *mlak*), cultic (*'nn ilm*) or political (*dll*, *'dd*, or *t'dt*) titles are applied to the messenger deities in the Ugaritic texts (esp. in the Baal Cycle), they remain semantically distinct. All terms represent the hierarchical level of Ugaritic divine messengers as lesser deities in the divine assembly.

2. Named Messenger Deities in the Ugaritic Texts

Whilst the majority of messenger deities remain anonymous, a few of them are known particularly by their own name in the Ugaritic tablets: representatively, Gupan and Ugar (Baal's messengers) and Qadesh-and-

⁹⁶ A remark of van Selms (1970: 252 n. 2) is plausible: "messengers are always sent at least in pairs, concordant with the principle 'only on the evidence of two witnesses, or of these witnesses, shall a charge be sustained', Deut. 19:15". This also explains the use of the word *t'dt*, 'testimony', as a parallel to *mlak*".

⁹⁷ The G. 3. m. pl. form of the Ug. $\sqrt{\text{phy}}$, to 'see, espy, look at, know, recognise, visit': DUL 667. Cf. RS Akk. (*w*)*apû*: AHW 1459-60; CAD 1/2[A] 201-4.

Amurr (Athirat's warrior-messenger). They may be regarded as chief-messenger deities in the divine assembly, and may be posited as the prototype of archangels in the Hebrew Bible. Qadesh-and-Amurr will be discussed in the following chapter of 'Lesser Deities as Warriors'.

2.1. Dual Names of Deities

In the Ugaritic poem, it is sometimes unclear whether the title of deities indicates two separate deities or a single deity, like others who have "double-barrelled" names⁹⁸. The Ugaritic artisan god⁹⁹ has his double-barrelled name: *ktr w ḥss*, 'Kothar-and-Hasis'¹⁰⁰. In the descriptions, he evidently speaks of himself in the singular: *rgmt*, 'I say' (KTU 1.4 vii 23) and *l hwty*, 'to my word' (KTU 1.4 vii 25). Similarly, some other deities have their names in the form of A-and-B. They may refer to either the assimilation of two figures into a single deity or the use of two epithets for one figure¹⁰¹: *qdš w amrr*, 'Qadesh-and-Amurr' (KTU 1.4 iv 13, etc.); *nkl w ib*, 'Nikkal-and-Ib' (KTU 1.24.1, 37); *mt w šr*, 'Hero¹⁰² and Sovereign' (KTU 1.23.8)¹⁰³; and *ltpn w qdš*, 'Wise and Holy One' (KTU 1.16 i 11, 21; also restored at 1.16 ii 49). The two elements of the divine characters are woven together into one name.

In fact, binomial names are common in the Ugaritic texts. However, they do not always constitute a single figure, but also two figures separated, like *šhr w šlm*, 'Shahar and Shalem', as at KTU 1.23.52. The *gpn w ugr*,

⁹⁸ Ginsberg (1944: 25) and Pope (1955: 44).

⁹⁹ Cf. M.S. Smith (1985) and Handy (1994: 133-6).

¹⁰⁰ Ug. *w* is here read as a conjunction between the two nouns: thus, 'Kothar-and-Hasis', in a hyphenated form. Cf. M.S. Smith (1994: 170-1; also, 167).

¹⁰¹ M.S. Smith (1994: 170).

¹⁰² Ug. *mt* may refer to 'man, husband, hero': DUL 598-9 (III). Cf. Heb. מַן: HALOT 653; Amor. *mut*: Huffmon (1965: 234-5); Akk. *mutu(m)*: AHw 690-1; CAD 10/2[M] 313-6.

¹⁰³ It is another epithet of El: Wyatt (1977; 1992b; and 2002: 326 n. 10); but, differently, the 'lord and master': Wyatt (2002: 326).

'Gupan¹⁰⁴ and Ugar¹⁰⁵', in the Baal Cycle can be seen also as the duality of the messengers. While they are insisted as a single deity characterized as "Baal's chief spokesman"¹⁰⁶ or Baal's "faithful retainer"¹⁰⁷, other major commentators take the stand that they are two divine figures¹⁰⁸. Hence the misunderstanding of the DNs as a single deity is due to the influence of the binominal names to indicate a single deity.

2.2. The Duality of Gupan and Ugar

The titles of Gupan and Ugar in KTU 1.3 iii and iv may indicate the fact that they are a pair of messengers: the *gpn w ugr* (KTU 1.3 iii 36; 1.4 vii 54) is interchangeably used with *ilm* (KTU 1.3 iii 32), *glm(m)* (KTU 1.3 iii 8; iv 5; 1.3 iv 5; 1.4 vii 52-3; 1.8 ii 5), and *'nn ilm* (KTU 1.3 iv 32; and 1.4 viii 15)¹⁰⁹.

It is true that it is sometimes not easy to determine whether these titles are used in the sense of a single deity, dual, or plural¹¹⁰: whilst the plural

¹⁰⁴ Ug. *gpn* probably refers to Heb. גפן and Akk. *gapnu*, 'vine': Albright (1941: 41 n. 19); followed by Pope (1965b: 284-5); de Moor (1971: 53); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 305). Differently, Cassuto (1971: 131) interprets that it corresponds to Heb. קנ (קנ), 'wing'; yet, as he admitted, the bi-consonantal letter is inadequate to prove its relevancy to the tri-consonantal letter.

¹⁰⁵ The suggestion of Albright (1941: 41 n. 19) that Ug. *ugr* is a loanword from Akk. *ugāru*, 'field', which is loaned originally from Sumerian is acceptable here to explain the meaning of the term; cf. *AHW* 1402. Differently, Cassuto (1971: 131) reads it as *Agūru*, 'hireling' (Heb. אגור) in regard to the reading of the three forms of Ug. א (Aleph): *a*, *i*, or *u*; also cf. Haas-Thiel (1979: 339-40): 'Schwert' as a weapon designation of a DN.

¹⁰⁶ Obermann (1948: 27).

¹⁰⁷ Albright (1968a: 89-90).

¹⁰⁸ Gordon (1949: 37-8); Gaster (1950: 127-8 and n. 45); Kapelrud (1952: 82); G.R. Driver (1956: 14); del Olmo (1981: 184-5).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Ginsberg (1944: 26-7); and Renfroe (1992: 23): "From this it is clear that *'nn* can designate subordinates (*glm*) who function in some texts as messengers but who, despite their lesser status, are nonetheless divine"; Renfroe (*ibid.*, 23 n. 36) further comments that in KTU 1.3 iv 32-5, "*'nn* is modified by the adjective *ilm* and stands parallel to the nouns 'gods' (*ilm*) and 'divine ones' (*ilnym*)".

¹¹⁰ Cf. Renfroe (1992: 23 n. 35).

ending *-m* signifies plural deities¹¹¹, it may denote also a single deity as a *-m* enclitic¹¹². The phrase *'nn ilm* may be translated as 'divine Clouds'¹¹³ or 'Clouds of the gods'¹¹⁴. Yet the latter presents a problem; it refers to the sender of messengers as plural. The sender, however, appears clearly as a singular deity in the texts: sc. Baal; and *ilm* is seen here as *il* (sg.) plus *-m* enclitic; thus, 'Clouds of the god' is better. Ginsberg translates the phrase *'nn ilm* as 'attendants of divinity', indicating also that *ilm* denotes a single 'deity'¹¹⁵. But since the term *ilm* can denote also a pair of messengers as a dual form, he translates the *'nn ilm* at KTU 1.4 viii 15 also as 'divine attendants'¹¹⁶, whereas Wyatt renders it as 'attendants of the god'¹¹⁷. The translation depends on the context of the text.

Other grammatical evidences give more confidence to support the idea that Gupan and Ugar are dual. In the descriptions, they take an important role between deities to convey messages; hence, they were instructed by Baal (KTU 1.3 iii 8-31) and they were sent to the goddess Anat (KTU 1.3 iii 32 ff.; cf. line 36); after delivering the message from Baal to Anat (KTU 1.3 iv 5-20), they left her and then came back to Baal (KTU 1.3 iv 32 ff.); at that time, Anat said to them:

<i>lk lk 'nn ilm</i>	Go, go! Clouds of the god!
<i>atm bštm</i>	You may go slowly ¹¹⁸ ;

¹¹¹ It can also be the dual ending. Cf. *UT* §8.5.

¹¹² Ginsberg (1944: 27 n. 10).

¹¹³ Ginsberg (1944: 27): 'divine attendants'.

¹¹⁴ Wyatt (2002: 82): 'Attendants of the gods', as a construct plus a genitive form.

¹¹⁵ Ginsberg (1944: 27 n. 8).

¹¹⁶ Ginsberg (1944: 28; cf. 27).

¹¹⁷ Wyatt (2002: 113).

¹¹⁸ The root of Ug. *bštm* has been suggested as *bš*, to 'depart' (de Moor, 1979: 647 n. 54). Yet, it is construed to be derived, more probably, from the $\sqrt{bš}$, to 'go slowly, be late': *UT* §19.532; *DUL* 242; Sanmartín (1978: 354 n. 44). Cf. Heb. בִּישׁ (cf., as a Polel, pf. form, בִּישׁ in Exod 32.1; Judg 5.28): *HALOT* 117; Ar. *bassa*: al-Yasin (1952: no. 93). For the argument against these etymological references, see M.S. Smith (1994: 44 n. 78). Thus, 'delay': Gibson

(KTU 1.3 iv 32-33; cf. 1.1 iii 17-8¹²⁰).

In regard to the term *bštm*, the 2 du. suffix *-m* may be employed with the $\sqrt{bš}$ in order to express the two messengers of Baal¹²¹. The term is used with the 2 du.¹²² pron. *atm*: hence, *atm bštm*, 'two of you may go slowly'¹²³. This supports the view that Gupan and Ugar are Baal's messengers as a pair. In other cases, similar grammatical evidence is found:

w *tb l mspr .. k tlakn glmm*

Now return to the narrative
when the Lads were sent

(KTU 1.4 v 42-43).

In this editorial note, Ug. *tlakn* is used here as a verbal predicate of Ug. *glmm*. The 3. m. du.¹²⁴ prefix *t-* and suffix *-n* are attached to the verbal root *lak* in order to express its dual form; thus the *glmm*, which refers to Gupan and Ugar here, are regarded as a pair of messengers. This realisation obviates the need to reject the view that the *gpn w ugr* can denote a pair of messengers.

In the story of Baal's dispatch of his messengers in KTU 1.4 vii and viii, evidence of a pair of entities gets stronger. As envoys of Baal, Gupan and

(1978: 51); Wyatt (2002: 82). Differently, Sivan (2001: 286) refers its Ugaritic root to the $\sqrt{bwš}$; against this, see del Olmo (1981: 530). Clifford (1972: 86-7 n. 59) argues that the verb is a stative perfect. But, as M.S. Smith (1994: 44) refutes it, it rather seems a verb of motion.

¹¹⁹ Ug. *šnt*, derived from the $\sqrt{šnw}$, to 'be disfigured, deformed, transform, change location'; hence, to 'leave for, depart': DUL 834-5. Cf. Heb. שָׁנָה: HALOT 1597-8; Akk. *šanû*: AHw 1166-7; CAD 17/1[Š] 403-8; Syr. *šn*: Brockelmann (1966: 789); cf. Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 171 n. v.). It may be construed as either an act. ptc. form (DUL 835) or G. 1. c. sg. form (Tropper, 2000: 665). For various options, cf. 'swift': Ginsberg (1969: 137); Clifford (1972: 86); 'quit': Gibson (1978: 51); 'hurry': Wyatt (2002: 82).

¹²⁰ In these paralleled lines, the speaker appears as Kothar-and-Hasis (KTU 1.1 iii 17).

¹²¹ Cf. M.S. Smith (1994: 159 n. 73).

¹²² It could also be read as a 2. pl. pron. However, it is more probable to read it as a du.

¹²³ Cf. Ginsberg (1944: 27).

¹²⁴ Although this form can be read also as 3. m. pl., it is hardly accepted in the context of descriptions that they may identify more than two figures.

Ugar are commanded to go to the god Mot in the underworld (KTU 1.4 vii 45-46, 52-54). Hence, in KTU 1.4 viii, Gupan and Ugar (cf. line 47: [gpn]w ugr) are instructed by Baal before being dispatched:

al y^cdbkm k imr b ph Do not let him place¹²⁵ you like a lamb
in his mouth

(KTU 1.4 viii 17-18).

Ug. *y^cdbkm* consists of a prefixed conjugation and a *-km* suffix, here to be taken as dual, to the verbal stem *‘db*. In the following lines of 20-21, another case of a dual indication appears:

tḥtan nrt ilm špš you shall be ground up¹²⁶ (by) the Lamp
of the gods, Shapsh.

Ug. *tḥtan* has been construed as a singular energetic¹²⁷; but the verbal form indicates more probably 2. c. dual¹²⁸ with prefix *t-* and suffix *-n*. Thus, Bauer indicates that Ug. *tḥtan* is related to the two messengers previously mentioned¹²⁹.

In the descriptions of KTU 1.5 i, Gupan and Ugar were instructed by Mot and they brought Mot’s message back to Baal (cf. KTU 1.5 i 12). In the lacuna between KTU 1.5 i and ii, they ‘must have been summoned again’¹³⁰. They were sent again to Mot with an obsequious reply from Baal (KTU 1.5 ii 8-20). At this time their appearance occurs also as a pair:

tb^c w l yṭb ilm The gods departed and did
not sit down.

¹²⁵ Ug. *‘db*, to ‘put, place, leave, set’: DUL 148. Cf. Heb. עִיב: HALOT 806-7; Akk. *ezēbu*: AHw 267 ff.; CAD 4[E] 416-26. It may be used here with the meaning of a cohortative: M.S. Smith (1997: 139).

¹²⁶ Ug. *ḥt²*, to ‘grind up, crush, annihilate’: DUL 413. Cf. Akk. *ḥatû*: AHw 336; CAD 6[H] 151-2. The verb is used here as a N form.

¹²⁷ Ginsberg (1944: 29).

¹²⁸ Tropper (2000: 499).

¹²⁹ Bauer (1936: 56).

¹³⁰ Wyatt (2002: 121 n. 33).

idk l ytn pn<m> ʿm bn ilm mt

Then certainly they set (their)

faces towards Son of El, Mot

(KTU 1.5 ii 13-14).

Either the semantic subject or syntactical subject of the three verbs (*tb*¹³¹, *yṭb*, and *ytn*) is to be Ug. *ilm*. They all are best construed as a 3. m. du. form¹³¹; the text runs as follows:

tša ghm w tšh

They lifted up (their) voices and they
shouted¹³²:

tḥm aliyn {bn} bʿl

‘Message of Mightiest Baal’

(KTU 1.5 ii 16-17).

Yet the two verbs (*tša* and *tšh*) above occur in the *t*-forms, which may refer to the female. Ginsberg said that if they are messengers of Baal, the *y*-forms may be congruent grammatically with *ilm* in line 13. He further argued that the gender of the two messengers is actually female and that they are perhaps messengers of Mot¹³³. However, Ginsberg later changed his mind so that the two verbs refer to two male individuals because any cases of *t*- can serve as a ‘prefix of the third person dual masculine’; thus, they are identified as Gupan and Ugar¹³⁴. The two deities who conveyed Baal’s message in KTU 1.5 ii 16 ff. are without a doubt the same messengers dispatched by Baal.

After the message of Mot is ended in KTU 1.5 ii 6a, Baal instructs his *ilm* again for another mission (KTU 1.5 ii 8 – 12). The context of the texts alludes to the fact that Mot’s message has probably been brought to Baal by

¹³¹ They can be taken also as a 3. m. pl. form. However, as discussed above, the divine figures are, more probably, referred to as two.

¹³² Ug. *šh*, to ‘exclaim, shout, invite, call, claim’: UT §19.2156; DUL 781-2. Cf. Heb. צוּחַ: HALOT 1011-2; Syr. *ṣwaḥ*: Brockelmann (1966: 623); Ar. *ṣāḥa*: AEL 1751-2; Akk. *ṣāḥu*: AHw 1096; CAD 16[Š] 64-5. Its form with the prefix *t*- here could also be read as a 3. pl.

¹³³ Ginsberg (1944: 29 n. 20).

¹³⁴ Ginsberg (1946: 40). The prefixed *t*- is more common than *y*- for the m. pl. form. Hence, Tropper (2000: 621, 645) also construes both as a 3. m. du.

Gupan and Ugar. Thus, it can be interpreted that they may be qualified as the intermediary messengers between supreme gods (KTU 1.5 i 12; cf. 1.3 iii 36)¹³⁵.

In KTU 1.5 vi 1-10, we read that the divine messengers, which may refer to Gupan and Ugar¹³⁶, carry sad news about Baal to El in their own words. Some verbs may be employed to indicate the duality of messengers: *tba*, 'they came'¹³⁷ (line 1); and other verbs, which may be construed as a 1. du. form: *sbn[y]*¹³⁸, '[w]e have turned around'¹³⁹ (lines 3-[4]); *mğny*, 'we came' (lines 5, 8)¹⁴⁰.

In Ugaritic grammar any dual form of the term could also be read as a plural or as a singular. However, as Ginsberg said¹⁴¹, how the number of the term is read should be dependent on the context of the text, its comparison, and common sense. Thus, the duality of Gupan and Ugar is preferred for the many evidences suggested above¹⁴².

¹³⁵ Cf. KTU 1.5 ii 13-4; they (*ilm*) are sent from Baal to Mot again. Thus, cf. de Moor (1971: 129): 'It is likely that occasionally they served other gods too (CTA 1:III.17; it may be recalled that the *Qds w ʿAmrr*, the regular attendant on Aṭiratu, serves as a messenger for Baal in CTA 3:F)'.
¹³⁶ Gibson (1978: 73 n. 2).

¹³⁷ Ug. *b²*, to 'enter, come, reach': DUL 203. Cf. Heb. בָּרָא: HALOT 112-4; Ph., Pun. *b²*: DNWSI 146; Ar. *bāʿa*: AEL 270-2; Akk. *bāʿu*: AHw 116; CAD 2[B] 178-82.

¹³⁸ Ug. *sbb* (*sbb*), to 'turn round, go round and round, go through, turn towards, turn, turn into': DUL 752. Cf. Heb. סָבַב: HALOT 738-40.

¹³⁹ Cf. Job 1.7; 2.2.

¹⁴⁰ The further example of the 1. du. ending *-ny* can be seen in the term *hlly*: the particle *hl* plus the 1. du. suffix *-ny*, thus, 'behold we' (KTU 2.1.3, etc.): Ginsberg (1944: 29 n. 20).

¹⁴¹ Cf. Ginsberg (1944: 26).

¹⁴² Against this view, see Wyatt (1992a: 421-2 and n. 119); he takes the *gpn w ugr* to be a single deity: 'assistant Gupan-and-Ugar ("Vine-and-Field"?).

Summary

Among other anonymous messengers the named messenger deities occur as *qdš w amrr* ('Qadesh-and-Amurr', Athirat's warrior-messenger: KTU 1.4 iv 13, etc.) and *gpn w ugr* ('Gupan and Ugar') in the Ugaritic texts. The binomial name of *gpn w ugr*, which is characterised as *ilm* (KTU 1.3 iii 32), *glm(m)* (KTU 1.3 iii 8), and *ʿnn ilm* (KTU 1.3 iv 32), indicates that they are two divine figures. Their duality is clarified by the following terms: *atm bštm* (KTU 1.3 iv 33); *tlakn glmm* (KTU 1.4 v 42-43); *yʿdbkm* (KTU 1.4 viii 17); *tḥtan* (KTU 1.4 viii 20); *tbʿ, yṯb, ytn* (KTU 1.5 ii 13-14); *tša, tṣḥ* (KTU 1.5 ii 16-17); and *tba, sbn[y]*, and *mḡny* (KTU 1.5 vi 1, 3-[4], 5, 8). They serve Mot (KTU 1.4 vii 45-46, 52-54) as well as Baal (KTU 1.3 iii 32 ff.; 1.3 iv 5-20). Thus, they are identified as the intermediary messengers between the higher gods.

3. The Procedure of Divine Messenger Dispatch in the Ugaritic Texts

The general procedure of divine 'messenger' dispatch in the Ugaritic texts consists of five stages: 1) the sending of messengers by their sender; 2) the travelling of messengers; 3) the arrival of messengers; 4) the delivering of the message to the recipient; and 5) the return of messengers¹⁴³.

3.1. The Sending of Messengers

The first consideration in the procedure of divine 'messenger' dispatch is the question of how divine messengers are charged for the mission. When Yam

¹⁴³ These patterns are categorised on the basis of the division described by Meier (1988). Differently, Cassuto (1971: 42) divides the whole procedure of communication as threefold: instructions of the sender to messengers; conveyance of the message to the recipient; and reply of the recipient (KTU 1.1; 1.3). Del Olmo (1981: 52-62) suggests that there are four patterns detailed by the literary form in correspondence: message, reaction, incantation, and binary forms (order-execution, invitation-acceptance, and deliberation-communication); also, cf. del Olmo (1984a).

commands his messengers to deliver his message to the divine council, he teaches them what they have to do when they arrive before dispatching them (KTU 1.2 i 13-9). Baal also instructs his messengers before sending them to Anat (KTU 1.3 iii 8-31). Thus, it is explicit that the instruction of the sender to his divine messengers normally precedes their departure on the mission¹⁴⁴.

In Ugaritic poetry, the message of the sender is often repeated in the instruction of the sender himself and in the delivery by messengers. Thus, it is evident that repetitions may have been aimed at the audience in the ancient epos¹⁴⁵.

3.2. The Travelling of Messengers

3.2.1. The Formula of 'Messenger' Dispatch

A certain procedure of the divine 'messenger' dispatch is found especially in the Baal Cycle, where some typical formulae are attested. The formula is represented frequently as *idk (y/t)tn pnm tk*, which literally means 'then give/set(s) face towards' DN and/or TN¹⁴⁶. In fact, it is a Semitic phrase, which is attested in Akkadian texts: thus, *pānam/pānī* (*ana* + inf. verb) *šakānum*, 'to set the face (to do)'¹⁴⁷. This has been suggested, probably, as West Semitic influence¹⁴⁸. It is found also in Hebrew verses: Gen 31.21; Num 14.4; and Neh 9.17¹⁴⁹.

¹⁴⁴ The structure of the instruction normally consists of two elements: the sender's command to his messengers to show their homage to the divine recipient and the sender's message of what they shall deliver.

¹⁴⁵ Cassuto (1971: 41). Such repetitions also serve strict literary purposes. Cf. the fourfold repetition of the duties of the pious son in *Aqhat*: Wyatt (1999: 256-8).

¹⁴⁶ E.g., Inbub, the dwelling of Anat, is introduced after the phrase as the destination of the journey at KTU 1.1 ii 14.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. EA 148:26-34; 151:37-40.

¹⁴⁸ *AHw* 702, 819-20.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Layton (1986).

The phraseology of *idk (y/t)tn pnm* is very frequently used in Ugaritic. The idiom occurs twenty-two times in the Ugaritic texts¹⁵⁰, where eight out of twenty-two relate to the dispatch of divine messengers: KTU 1.1 ii 13-14 (Messengers of El); 1.2 i 13-14, 19-20 (Messengers of Yam); 1.3 vi 12-13 (Qadesh-and-Amurr); 1.4 viii 1, 10-11, 1.5 i 9-10, and 1.5 ii 13-14 (Gupan and Ugar, messengers of Baal). Thus, the phrase *(y/t)tn pnm tk* may signify features of the departure of messengers on their journey.

3.2.2. The Length of the Journey

With regard to the mission of messengers, their journey is often said to cover a great distance. The formula is used typically in KTU 1.1 iii; the distance is a long way from the house of El to Egypt:

b alp šd r[bt kmn] across a thousand miles¹⁵¹ , ten
[thousand leagues¹⁵²]¹⁵³
(KTU 1.1 iii 2¹⁵⁴).

The estimate of the distance may be the length that the divine messengers are to traverse between the place of departure and the destination¹⁵⁵; it gives the

¹⁵⁰ CPU 1688-9.

¹⁵¹ Ug. *šd*, 'a strip, a length of land, patch': DUL 809-10; 'mile': Wyatt (2002: 43). Cf. Akk. *šiddu*: AHw 1230; CAD 17/2[Š] 403-7.

¹⁵² Ug. *kmn*, 'acre': DUL 445-6 (I); 'league': Wyatt (2002: 43). Cf. Akk. *kumānu*: AHw 505; CAD 8[K] 532.

¹⁵³ Wyatt (1996: 34-5) interprets the formula as indicating 'a measure of distance rather than area'; hence, 'the scale of space is a symbol of their power'. Yet the two terms, *šd* and *kmn* as in KTU 1.2 iii 10 and 11, can also be "translated as area terms even when they are clearly used in a linear sense (e.g. KTU 1.1 iii 2)": Wyatt (2002: 53 n. 68).

¹⁵⁴ The formula *alp šd rbt kmn* occurs also in KTU 1.3 vi 17-18, 1.4 viii 24-26, etc.

¹⁵⁵ Gibson (1978: 55); Coogan (1978:96); del Olmo (1981: 161); and cf. Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 178).

impression that the messengers travel vast distances in their mutual communication¹⁵⁶.

In KTU 1.4 viii 24-26, the foregoing 'departure' formula of messengers, (y/t)tn pnm, is absent before the 'distance' phrase, b alp šd rbt kmn. Pardee suggests that the 'distance' phrase at this place is syntactically related not to the movement of messengers, but to the following verb hbr, to 'bow' (at the feet of Mot)¹⁵⁷. However, the parallel line of KTU 1.3 iv 37 shows the presence of the phrase (y/t)tn pnm; and it becomes evident that the phrase b alp šd rbt kmn is closely related to the (y/t)tn pnm; therefore, the distance can be syntactically, and even more semantically, connected to the messengers' departure¹⁵⁸:

idk l ttn pnm ʿm bʿl mrym špn b alp šd rbt kmn

Then certainly she set (her) face towards Baal (in) the height¹⁵⁹
of Saphon, across a thousand miles, ten thousand leagues

(KTU 1.3 iv 37-38; cf. 1.5 i 9-11).

Incidentally, the distance is compared with the diplomatic gesture of obeisance before royal figures¹⁶⁰:

l pʿn adtny mrḥqtm qlny at the feet of our lady from a
distance¹⁶¹ we prostrate ourselves

¹⁵⁶ The phraseology of alp šd ... rbt kmn is used exceptionally to indicate the dimensions of Baal's palace in KTU 1.4 v 56-7.

¹⁵⁷ Pardee (1976: 227).

¹⁵⁸ Cf. M.S. Smith (1994: 168).

¹⁵⁹ Ug. mrym; 'height, top, summit (of a mountain)': DUL 579-80. Cf. Heb. מְרוֹם: HALOT 633; Pun. mrm: DNWSI 694.

¹⁶⁰ Loewenstamm (1980: 246-8).

¹⁶¹ A f. form, with a m- prefix and -m suffix, of Ug. rḥq, 'distant': DUL 738. Cf. Heb. רָחוֹק: HALOT 1214-6; Akk. rēqu, rūqu: AHw 971, 995-6; CAD 14[R] 265-8; 421-5. In a note on KTU 2.12.8-10, Ginsberg (1938b: 19 and n. 7) interprets the suffix -m of Ug. mrḥqtm as a dual: thus, šbʿd w šbʿid mrḥqtm, "seven times one way and seven times the other way, on belly and back", on the basis of the Amarna formula 7-šū ū 7-anni, 'seven that and seven this'; however, in Akk. letters from the archive of the royal palace of Ugarit, its Akk. parallel phrase ištu

The term *mrhqtu* indicates the distance between the ones who prostrate and the lady. A Hebrew text can be given here for comparison¹⁶²:

והשתחוויתם מרחק and you shall prostrate yourselves from a
distance¹⁶³

(Exod 24.1).

The two Ugaritic lines above describe the rendering of homage. In these cases, the phrase meaning 'from a distance' may be related to the expression of homage. However, as seen in the case of KTU 1.1 iii 2 above, a great distance in 'messenger' descriptions is not related to any expression of reverence. It is related, more probably, to the distance of the journey for the messengers.

The fact that divine messengers could reach their destination only after a long journey need not be understood as a sign of their weakness. The remoteness of regions between the sender and the recipient implies the boundary of vast independent dimensions of the divine rule of each god. Then the lengthy journey between two divine realms may denote the legitimate activity of the divine agents as envoys¹⁶⁴.

rūqiš gives another possibility to interpret *-m*; thus, Nougayrol (1956: 221, 226): *ana šēpē^{meš} bēliya ištu rūqiš 2šú 7šú amqut*, 'Au pied de mon maître, de loin, 2 fois 7 fois je m'effondre'; as the adverbial *-m*, see Gordon (1965: §11.5); accepted by Loewenstamm (1967: 41 n. 1). Differently, yet more possibly, as an enclitic particle *-m*: Tropper (2000: 762-3).

¹⁶² Loewenstamm (1967: 42-3; 1980: 246-8).

¹⁶³ Heb. רחוק/רחק, 'distant, distance': BDB 935; HALOT 1214-6.

¹⁶⁴ Wyatt (1996: 34-5) argues that the long distance of the divine messengers' journey is here taken not as a literal meaning but as the rhetorical expression, as the 'epic style of the myth'. At any rate, it denotes the powerful and heroic movement of deities. It may also signify the flying function of the divine messengers.

3.3. The Arrival of Messengers

3.3.1. Showing Homage to the Divine Recipient

When divine messengers arrive at their destination, as described in KTU 1.2 i, they bow down to the recipient as a gesture of homage. In the ancient Near East, prostrating oneself with respect before a superior figure was an accustomed convention of a man of greatly inferior rank¹⁶⁵. The mortal world mirrors the realm of the deities. Thus a gesture of ‘prostrating oneself before someone’ refers to a nonverbal indication of the rank difference between deities in the divine world: an inferior god usually bows down to a superior god.

Thus, as soon as they arrive from their long travels, divine messengers are supposed to render homage to the divine recipient of higher rank. One of the actions taken by messengers is a prostration at the feet of the recipient; thus they bow down to Mot for paying their homage, as at KTU 1.4 viii 26-29:

<i>l p^cn mt hbr w ql</i>	At the feet of Mot bow and fall down,
<i>tšthwy w kbd</i>	prostrate yourselves and pay homage (to
	him) ¹⁶⁶ .

Before dispatching them, in fact, the sender instructs his messengers to show homage to the recipient(s) as a diplomatic gesture:

<i>[l p^cn il] al tpl</i>	[At the feet of El] certainly you shall fall;
<i>al tšthwy p^hr [m^cd]</i>	certainly you shall prostrate yourselves
	(to) the assembly of [the council]!

(KTU 1.2 i 14-15).

¹⁶⁵ Gruber (1980: 292).

¹⁶⁶ ‘Fourteen’ prostrations may be given, as mentioned under discussion of Ug. *mrḥqtm* (see n. 161 above); sometimes in the salutation of the epistles between mortals: *l p^cn adty šb^cd w šb^cid mrḥqtm qlt*, ‘at the feet of my lady seven times and seven times from a distance I have prostrated myself’ (KTU 2.12.6-11): cf. Ginsberg (1938b). Ug. *šb^c(i)d* is here used adverbially: del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 804).

Some have construed Ug. *al* in a negative sense¹⁶⁷. Yet it can be interpreted as an emphasised nuance in the context¹⁶⁸. Moreover, Ug. *qmm*, to 'stand up', applied to the messengers in the following line (KTU 1.2 i 31) presupposes the fact that they have already prostrated themselves before the recipient. In other words, their position of bowing down is a prerequisite for the usage of Ug. *qm*¹⁶⁹.

3.4. The Delivering of the Message

In the Ugaritic texts messages from the sender were written on tablets¹⁷⁰ but delivered orally to the recipient by divine messengers¹⁷¹.

3.4.1. A Formula of Messenger Speech

As soon as the divine messengers arrive at their destination, they conform to the diplomatic norm; they introduce themselves to the recipient by rendering their homage to him or her; and they begin to deliver the message in a formula of Messenger Speech.

This formula is constituted by the divine messengers themselves in order to authenticate their role as the emissaries who deliver a message from

¹⁶⁷ Aistleitner (1964: 48); Ginsberg (1969: 130); Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 129 n. m); Mullen (1980: 124); de Moor (1987: 31); M.S. Smith (1994: 265, 288); and Pardee (1997: 246).

¹⁶⁸ Cf. G.R. Driver (1956: 79); Jirku (1962: 22); de Moor (1971: 124); Gibson (1978: 40); del Olmo (1981: 169); and Wyatt (2002: 58 n. 102).

¹⁶⁹ Wyatt (2002: 59 n. 103).

¹⁷⁰ In KTU 1.2 i 14-17, Yam sent his messengers to the divine council with his message tablet (*lht*, KTU 1.2 i 26).

¹⁷¹ It may take an analogy from ancient Semitic society; hence, an Akkadian usage informs that it has been conducted mostly by an oral report in the human world: sc. by a man who 'seizes words in his mouth', *ša awātim ina pîm iṣabbatu* (ARM 1 76.27); that is to say, the one who 'has a good memory'; cf. Meier (1988: 26, n. 41). For an instance from the Hebrew Bible, Yahweh gives Moses his words at Sinai on two tablets of stone, which have to be delivered to the Israelites through Moses' oral accounts (Exod 31.18; Deut 5.22; 9.10). But it is not described in the Ugaritic texts if a message has been delivered by divine messengers' oral repetition from their memory, or by their reading from the tablets.

the sender. An example of the oral formula may be found at 1.3 iii 11-14. They are commanded first to speak to the recipient and then to declare whose message it is:

<i>w rgm l btl̄t ʕnt</i>	And speak ¹⁷² to Virgin Anat,
<i>tny l ymmt limm</i>	say to Dove ¹⁷³ of Potent One ¹⁷⁴ :
<i>thm aliyn bʕl</i>	"Message ¹⁷⁵ of Mightiest Baal,
<i>hwt aliyn qrdm</i>	Word ¹⁷⁶ of Powerful Hero ¹⁷⁷ "

(KTU 1.3 iii 11-14).

Here the sender of the message is Baal; therefore the basic oral formula of the divine messengers can be formed by *rgm l*-DN¹; *thm* DN², 'Speak to DN¹ (sc. the recipient); (this is) the message of DN² (sc. the sender)'¹⁷⁸. The formula occurs mainly in delivering messages in numerous Ugaritic letters¹⁷⁹. In a

¹⁷² Ug. *rgm*, 'say, tell, announce, communicate, inform, answer, recite': DUL 732-4; to 'speak, shout': Huehnergard (1987: 52, 177); Watson (1996: 78). Cf. Ar. *rağama*, *tarğama*: AEL 1047-9.

¹⁷³ Whilst Ug. *ymmt* has been suggested as a mistake of Ug. *ybm̄t*, 'sister-in-law' (G.R. Driver, 1956: 158; del Olmo-Sanmartín, 2004: 951), it is proposed, more credibly, as a cognate of Ar. *yamamat*, 'pigeon, dove', hence, 'Beloved': Wyatt (1992a: 417-9; 2002: 77).

¹⁷⁴ Ug. *lim* has been understood as a cognate of Heb. לָאִם (לְאִים), 'people' (BDB 522; DCH 496-7; HALOT 513) and Akk. *limu* (AHw 553-4; CAD 9[L] 197-8): Albright (1938b: 19 n. 6); cf. 'ruler': G.R. Driver (1956: 158); 'Li'mite': de Moor (1969: 183; 1971: 97); 'Nations': de Moor (1987: 7 and n. 35). But it is construed, possibly, as a divine title of Baal: 'Prince': Gray (1965: 43); but, more probably, the 'Potent, Powerful One' (the *lim*, derived from the $\sqrt{l'y}$, plus *-m* enclitic): Wyatt (1992a: 417-9; 2002: 77).

¹⁷⁵ Ug. *thm*, 'message, decree': DUL 865. For its variant etymological opinions, see Virolleaud (1931: 217); van Zijl (1972: 55, 74); de Moor (1971: 102); and Watson (1998: 745-8).

¹⁷⁶ Ug. *hwt*, 'word, statement': DUL 349. Cf. Akk. *awātu*: AHw 89-90; CAD 1/2[A] 29-44.

¹⁷⁷ Ug. *qrdm*, 'hero, powerful one': DUL 709-10. Cf. Akk. *qar(r)ādu*: AHw 905; CAD 13[Q] 140-4.

¹⁷⁸ The same Ugaritic formula is found in KTU 1.1 iii 4-6; KTU 1.4 viii 29-35, etc. Cf. 1.3 iv 7-8.

¹⁷⁹ Loewenstamm (1980: 256 nn. 4 and 4a).

formula is not found when Yahweh speaks to a human directly (1 Kgs 3.5). Thus, it may be perceived as a speech form used only for mediating between Yahweh and a human. It introduces words from Yahweh:

ואמרת אליו	And say to him;
כה אמר יהוה	thus says Yahweh ...

(Exod 9.13b).

In addition, a verbal form שלח may precede the basic formula¹⁸⁷:

אני שולח אותך אליהם	I am sending ¹⁸⁸ you to them;
ואמרת אליהם	and you shall say to them;
כה אמר אדני יהוה	'thus says the Lord Yahweh...'

(Ezek 2.4b).

Both Akk. *umma* and Heb. כה in the formula function as adverbs meaning 'thus', which introduce a direct quotation¹⁸⁹.

As seen above, especially in the Akkadian epistles, the formula of Messenger Speech is commonly used for diplomatic, and even for the description of divine correspondence¹⁹⁰. In the Ugaritic texts, it is employed similarly in the Baal Cycle by using two basic epistolary terms: *rgm* and *thm*. Thus it can be inferred that the oral formula used widely in the ancient Semitic world has been considered also to describe the Divine Messenger Speech form.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Meier (1992: 121-9). In the Ugaritic texts, the sender's announcement of the dispatching of his messengers is employed before the Ugaritic formula of Messenger Speech (KTU 1.4 viii 29-35): thus, *dll al ilak l bn ilm mt*, 'I will surely send a messenger to divine Mot' (KTU 1.4 vii 45-6).

¹⁸⁸ A ptc. form of the Heb. שלח, to 'send (messenger), stretch out': BDB 1018-9; HALOT 1511-6; Ph., Pun., Aram. šlh: DNWSI 1136-41; Akk. šalû: AHw 1152; CAD 17/1[Š] 272; Ug. šlh: DUL 816.

¹⁸⁹ Not infrequently, a subordinate clause is introduced simply by Akk. *umma* followed by the PN², with the particle *-ma*, which should not be translated. The reason for the addition of *-ma* after Akk. *qibi* and the PN² is probably for euphony.

¹⁹⁰ See Rainey (1969: 142); cf. Loewenstamm (1980: 256-61).

In ancient Semitic literature, messengers often did not distinguish themselves from their sender when delivering messages so that the messengers speak in the first person as if the sender of the message speaks. However, when the prefatory formula, 'PN or DN (the sender) says to you', precedes such 'first person' speech of the messengers, it becomes clear that the divine messengers are not identified with their sender although they speak in the first person; they only deliver the message *verbatim*. In other words, almost always after delivering this prerequisite formula, messengers have delivered their sender's message. This formula may be applied in the same way to the delivering patterns of the divine messengers.

3.5. The Return of Messengers

After the message is delivered, divine messengers are sent back with the recipient's reply (cf. KTU 1.3 iv 21-31) and commended by the recipient to depart quickly: *lk lk 'nn ilm atm bštm w an šnt*, 'Go, go! Clouds of the god! You may go slowly, but I shall leave' (cf. KTU 1.1 iii 17-18 [by Kothar-and-Hasis]; and 1.3 iv 32-33 [by Anat]).

One of the significant descriptions of 'messenger activity' is an address that they are slow (*bštm*). It has been posited that Ug. *bštm* has a cognate root of Heb. בָּשַׁשׁ (בּוֹשֵׁשׁ), to 'delay'¹⁹¹, as at Judg 5.28; and Exod 32.1¹⁹²:

וירא העם כי בשש משה לרדת מן ההר

And the people saw that Moses delayed to come down from
the mountain.

In the 'messenger' context, it is interesting that Moses, the messenger of Yahweh, is slow in his movement to deliver Yahweh's message to the people, whilst Yahweh urges him to depart: לך רד, 'go¹⁹³! Go down¹⁹⁴!' (v. 7)¹⁹⁵.

¹⁹¹ For its lexical note, see n. 118 above.

¹⁹² Cf. Ginsberg (1944: 27 n. 9); Gordon (1965: §19.532); Clifford (1972: 86 n. 59); and del Olmo (1981: 530).

In the Ugaritic descriptions, divine messengers are also urged to depart rapidly by their sender: in KTU 1.2 i, Yam commands his divine messengers to leave quickly; hence, *tb^c glm[m al t̄b]*, ‘depart, Lads, do not sit down!’ (line 13). The phrase *l ytb*, ‘they did not sit down’ (line 19) describes how the divine messengers responded to their sender’s command. Its analogy is found in a case of human messengers; thus, King Keret sends his messengers to King Pabil:

ttb^c mlakm l ytb Messengers departed; they did not
sit down;

idk pnm l ytn ^cmm pbl mlk then (their) faces certainly they set
towards King Pabil.

(KTU 1.14 vi 35-38).

Summary

It is attested that there are some Ugaritic formulas in the descriptions of the ‘messenger’ dispatch, which are articulated through a five step pattern: the sending of messengers by their sender; the travelling of messengers; the arrival of messengers; the delivering of the message to the recipient; and the return of messengers. Divine messengers are instructed by the sender before their departure. Something similar to the Ugaritic formula, such as *(y/t)tn pnm tk*, ‘give/set(s) face towards’, is found in other Semitic texts. When they arrive at the destination after their long journey, messengers render to the recipient their homage, which indicates their lesser rank. Their delivery of

¹⁹³ The Impv. form of the Heb. $\sqrt{\text{הלך}}$, to ‘go, come, walk’: BDB 229-37; HALOT 246-8; Ph., Pun., Moab., Aram., *hlk*: DNWSI 280-1; Akk. *alāku*: AHw 31-4; CAD 1/1[A] 300-28; Ar. *halaka*: AEL 3044.

¹⁹⁴ The Impv. form of the Heb. $\sqrt{\text{ירד}}$, to ‘come, go down, descend’: BDB 432-4; HALOT 434-5; Ph., Pun., *yrđ*: DNWSI 468-9; Akk. (w)*arādu*: AHw 1462-3; CAD 1/2[A] 212-20; Ar. *warada*: AEL 2935-6; Ug. *yrđ*: DUL 977-8.

¹⁹⁵ LXX reads the text $\beta\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\zeta\epsilon\ \tau\acute{o}\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\varsigma$, ‘go quickly’.

the message follows a formula of Messenger Speech (*rgm l-DN¹; tħm DN², 'Speak to DN¹; message of DN²'*), which is attested also in other Semitic descriptions. After completing their mission, they are urged to leave.

4. Messenger Theophany in the Ugaritic Texts

This research will discuss the 'messenger' theophany attested in the Ugaritic texts. When Ugaritic messenger deities arrive at their destination after their long journey, their appearance is described as associated with a light (KTU 1.2 i 31-33). Now the fiery mode of the theophany of messengers is expected to represent their authority received from the sender and his majestic presence.

4.1. Yam's Messengers

After his coronation, Yam needed to restrain any threat to his rule; thus, Yam sent his two 'unnamed' messengers to demand the surrender of Baal. According to the tablets of KTU 1.2 i and iii, his messengers to the pantheon, the assembly of the gods, were intended to carry out this task. When *mlak ym*, 'messengers of Yam' (paralleled with another epithet *t'dt tp! [nhr]*, the 'embassy of Judge [Nahar]', in KTU 1.2 i 22), arrived, the *ilm*, 'gods', were gathered together at dinner; and they fearfully showed their homage to Yam's messengers (KTU 1.2 i 23-24):

tgly ilm rišthm l ʒr brkthm w l kħt zblhm b hm

The Gods lowered¹⁹⁶ their heads on top of¹⁹⁷ their knees, and onto the thrones¹⁹⁸ of their princships¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁶ Ug. *gly*, to 'fall (down), lower, bow': de Moor (1971: 68, 232); DUL 321-2. Cf. Ar. *ġalā*: AEL 2287-8.

¹⁹⁷ Ug. *ʒr*, 'back'; with a preposition, it may denote 'on the shoulder of, on top (of), upon': DUL 1005. Cf. Heb. צֹהַר: HALOT 1008; Akk. *ṣēru*: AHw 1093; CAD 16[S] 261; Ar. *zahr*: AEL 1927-30.

Before delivering messages, messengers normally bow low first to the one who will receive the messages, but now the gods in the pantheon first bow down to Yam's messengers, breaking a common convention. Baal was irked by this; since Yam was his rival, Baal rebuked this kind of response of the gods to the messengers (KTU 1.2 i 24 ff.). So the question of why they have paid homage to the messengers raises some issues here.

The status of the messengers is emphasised as the 'embassy' of the newly enthroned divine ruler (KTU 1.2 i 22). Hence, the messengers are regarded as the ones who represent the authority of Yam when they deliver the content of the tablets, in which Yam's words are written. Consequently Baal asks the gods of the pantheon why they were afraid of the divine messengers:

aḥd ilm t'ny lḥt mlak ym t'dt tpt nh<r>

I see (that) gods respond²⁰⁰ (to) the tablet²⁰¹ of the messengers of Yam, of the embassy of Judge Naha<r>

¹⁹⁸ Ug. *kḥt*, 'throne': DUL 434. Cf. EA Akk. *kaḥṣu*: AHw 420; CAD 8[K] 36.

¹⁹⁹ Ug. *zbl*, 'prince' (DUL 998), with a pronominal suffix *-hm* may here be interpreted either as 'princely' (G.R. Driver, 1956: 79; Caquot-Szzyner, 1974: 130; Clear, 1976: 4; Gibson, 1978: 41; Coogan, 1978: 87; Pardee, 1997: 246) or 'princeship' (Wyatt, 2002: 60), which is employed here. Differently, 'lordship': Gordon (1949: 13); 'exalted' (de Moor, 1987: 32); 'royal' (M.S. Smith, 1994: 266).

²⁰⁰ The first term of the phrase may be read as a G. 1. sg. form of the \sqrt{hdy} (DUL 356-7; cf. Heb. חָדָה (חֹדֶה): HALOT 292, 301; Ph., Aram. *ḥzy*: DNWSI 357-61); G.R. Driver (1956: 79 and n. 10); Jirku (1962: 22); Ginsberg (1969: 130); Oldenburg (1969: 192); Coogan (1978: 87); and Wyatt (2002: 60 and n. 109). Differently, 'unite', as an imperative: Aistleitner (1964: 49); Clear (1974: 4). Ug. *t'ny* is derived probably from the \sqrt{ny} , to 'answer' (cf. Heb. עָנָה). It has been taken differently as a D. form of the \sqrt{nw} , to 'humiliate': G.R. Driver (*ibid.*); Jirku (*ibid.*); Ginsberg (*ibid.*); Oldenburg (*ibid.*, 192 and n. 7.); del Olmo (1981: 171); Wyatt (*ibid.*, but from the \sqrt{ny}); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 172). Cf. 'let ... read', as a cohortative: Gordon (1949: 13). The interpretation of Ug. *aḥd* as the subject, meaning 'one', does not agree grammatically with the 3. m. pl. verb *t'ny*: 'L'un des dieux doit répondre' (Caquot-Szzyner, 1974: 130); as a interrogative, 'will any of the gods answer?' (Gibson, 1978: 41). De Moor's (1971: 124; 1987: 32) reading of the verb as a 1. sg. is not acceptable: 'alone I will answer'. Ug.

An additional consideration is the fact that the messengers appeared as a blazing existence in the divine assembly:

<i>qmm atr amr</i>	Standing up, then, they spoke;
<i>[tn]y d^cthm</i>	They [repeated ²⁰²] their knowledge ²⁰³ .
<i>išt išt^m yitmr</i>	(As) a great fire ²⁰⁴ they appeared ²⁰⁵ ;
<i>hrb l^tšt [lš]nhm</i>	A sharpened ²⁰⁶ sword was their [ton]gue ²⁰⁷

ilm is taken, most probably, as the subject of the plural verb here. Cf. 'in union will the gods answer': M.S. Smith (1994: 266); 'as one must the gods answer': Pardee (1997: 246).

²⁰¹ Ug. *lh*, 'tablet, message': DUL 494-5. Cf. Heb. לִיחַ: HALOT 522-3; Akk. *lēʾu*: AHw 546; CAD 9[L] 156-9; Ar. *lawh*: AEL 2679. Tablets contain the message of the sender. Cf. Wyatt (2002: 60 n. 10): 'the message would be written on a cuneiform tablet, which the messengers would read'. The words of the second gods seem to represent their authority and power, when they declare a divine war or when they order the cessation of the war. Thus, Baal is proclaiming to bring the war to an end with the authority of his words: KTU 1.3 iii 13-31.

²⁰² Ug. *tny*, to 'repeat, reiterate': DUL 924-5. Cf. Heb. שָׁנָה: HALOT 1598-9; Akk. *šanū*: AHw 1165-7; CAD 17/1[Š] 398-403; Ar. *tanā*: AEL 356-61; 1475-6.

²⁰³ Ug. *d^ct*, 'knowledge, information, communiqué, friendship': DUL 259-60. Cf. Heb. דַּעַת: HALOT 228-9; Pun. *d^ct*: DNWSI 440; Akk. *di/aʿ(a)tu*: AHw 168; CAD 3[D] 130-1. It indicates here the 'message' of Yam. Cf. Oldenburg (1969: 192): 'message'.

²⁰⁴ The phrase *išt išt^m* is understood here as a construct phrase with a superlative sense (*-m* enclitic on the second *išt*); thus, 'as a great blaze': Wyatt (2002: 61). Differently, as paronomasia, 'a flame, two flames': Miller (1965: 257); '(like) a fire, two fires': Gibson (1978: 42), *et al.*

²⁰⁵ Ug. *yitmr* is construed as a Gt. pf. 3. m. du. form of the \sqrt{mr} , to 'look at, be seen'; thus, 'they looked': Gordon (1949: 14); Oldenburg (1969: 192: 'are seen'); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 71-2); Tropper (2000: 519): sc. Yam's two messengers. Cf. Akk. *amāru*: AHw 40-2; CAD 1/2[A] 5-27. But it may better be translated as 'they appeared': Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 131); Gibson (1978: 42); Watson (1981: 191); M.S. Smith (1994: 267); and Wyatt (2002: 61). Cf. 'they looked like': Coogan (1978: 87); de Moor (1987: 33); Pardee (1997: 246). G.R. Driver (1956: 81) and Jirku (1962: 23) take, unlikely, the *hrb l^tšt* as the subject of the verb *yitmr*: 'the sharpened swords ... appeared'. Differently, Ginsberg (1969: 130): 'flash'; Sivan (2001: 130): 'he views', as a 3. m. sg. form; in this case, however, *yitmr* is more appropriate for its reading. Cf. *yitmr b^l bnth*, 'Baal views his daughters' (KTU 1.3 i 22-3).

²⁰⁶ The G. pass. ptc. f. form of the Ug. $\sqrt{ltš}$, to 'sharpen': Heb. לָטַשׁ: HALOT 528.

The fiery theophany of the messengers is connected to their speech. Two verbs, *amr* and *yitmr*, are related by the juxtaposition of the meanings; to 'speak' and to 'appear' in order to speak²⁰⁸. Through their speech and appearance, therefore, the messengers express their authority, derived from their sender as well as the awesome power of the sender in order to demand Baal's surrender.

Wyatt interprets the situation: "It is presumably the text on the tablets, carrying Yam's demands (the 'Word of God'), which cowers the gods, rather than the messengers themselves"²⁰⁹. It may be right when one considers the important position of Yam in the pantheon. The fiery theophany of the messengers, however, may be another reason for the response of other lesser gods to them in KTU 1.2 i 22-24. As a f. du. form, Ug. *ištm* refers here to the fiery theophany of the two messengers. Fires have been regarded as the swords of the messengers²¹⁰. Yet it is related more probably to the scribe's description of the theophany itself.

With regard to the fact that the gods in the pantheon were afraid, therefore, two supposed reasons may be given: it was caused by Yam's message itself and by the fiery theophany of the divine messengers which expresses their authority received from Yam, and which also represents his majestic presence. In fact, it can hardly be understood otherwise than as the suggestion that the messengers appeared in a frightening shape; perhaps as lightning. This scene is reminiscent of an action that Moses took before the

²⁰⁷ Ug. *lšn*, 'tongue': DUL 505-6. Cf. Heb. לָשׁוֹן: HALOT 536; Ph., Aram. *lšn*: DNWSI 584-5; Akk. *lišānu*: AHw 556 ; CAD 9[L] 209-15; Ar. *lisān*: AEL 3010.

²⁰⁸ Sanmartín (1973: 263-70); M.S. Smith (1994 : 307).

²⁰⁹ Wyatt (2002: 60 n. 108).

²¹⁰ Caquot-Szzyr (1974: 131 n. u): "Ces feux sont ceux des regards ou des épée des ambassadeurs".

messenger of Yahweh appeared as a blazing fire (Exod 3.1-6)²¹¹. The awe, which the gods in the pantheon felt, may be the same that Moses felt whilst looking upon the flaming appearance of the messenger at Sinai. This conspicuous form was enough to frighten him.

In addition, it is crucial to note the swords in the Ugaritic text. Some have reconstructed the lines 32-33 as *ḥrb lṣt [bym]nhm*, 'a sharpened sword was [in] their rig[ht hands]'²¹², whereas P.D. Miller has taken the last term as *[lš/bym]nhm*²¹³. It has also been taken, less probably, as *[ḥ]nhm*, 'are their [ey]es'²¹⁴. But the reading as *[lš]nhm* is preferred here²¹⁵. It may be a metaphoric expression of their speech, conveying the sender's demand.

4.2. Athirat's Messenger

Qadesh-and-Amurr²¹⁶ appears also as a luminous figure, whilst he leads the way, preceding Athirat who is riding upon a donkey:

qdš yuḥdm šbḥr

Qadesh began²¹⁷ to illuminate himself²¹⁸;

²¹¹ Similar imagery is found in other biblical descriptions: Ps 29.7; Judg 13.20; Isa 6.6; and cf. 2 Kgs 2.11.

²¹² Gaster (1950: 139); G.R. Driver (1956: 81); Jirku (1962: 23); and Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 131 and n. v).

²¹³ Miller (1965: 257 and nn. 7-8; 1973: 31); Hendel (1985: 674).

²¹⁴ Aistleitner (1964: 49); Ginsberg (1969: 130); Oldenburg (1969: 192).

²¹⁵ Cross (1973: 190, n. 187); Gibson (1978: 42); de Moor (1987: 33); M.S. Smith (1994: 267); Pardee (1997: 246); Wyatt (2002: 61). The sword imagery with lesser deities is found often in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 3.24, as a flaming sword (cf. Hendel, 1985: 671-4); Num 22.31; Josh 5.13; 1 Chr 21.27, 30; and cf. Ps 57.5, 64.4, 140.4; Rev 1.16; 19.15.

²¹⁶ The identity of *qdš w amrr* shall be discussed further in Chapter IV.

²¹⁷ Ug. *yuḥdm*, from the $\sqrt{\text{ḥd}}$, to 'seize'; and, to 'start', as an inchoative meaning: Cassuto (1975: 186-7); DUL 36-8. Cf. Heb. הָדָה : HALOT 31-2; Aram. ḥd/z : DNWSI 35-8; Akk. *aḥāzu*: AHw 18-20; CAD 1/1[A] 173-8; Ar. *ḥaḍa*: AEL 28-31. Differently, Watson (1978: 399): to 'kindle'; also, Watson (1992: 227 n. 31).

²¹⁸ Ug. *šbḥr*; the Ṣ form of the $\sqrt{\text{bḥr}}$, to 'ignite, burn, scorch the earth, illuminate'; cf. DUL 212 (I). Cf. Heb. *bḥr*: HALOT 145-6. Differently, to 'lead': Ginsberg (1969: 133); de Moor (1987: 52)

amrr k kbkb l pnm

Amurr (began to illuminate himself)

like a star in front²¹⁹

(KTU 1.4 iv 16-17).

Whilst the first verb in the first phrase has been translated with a passive meaning (Qadesh 'was kindled like a torch')²²⁰, it has been read also as an active meaning (Qadesh 'took a torch')²²¹. Following the active translation, Wyatt tries to reconstruct the text as *yuhd mšb ʿr*²²². However, the first phrase is more probably to be construed as having an active auxiliary verb and the infinitive Š form of the verb *b ʿr*²²³; hence, the second verb, *šb ʿr*, is associated to the first verb *yuhdm*. Their radiant theophany is suggested possibly by the following phrase in the next line: a comparative particle plus a noun meaning 'star' (*k kbkb*)²²⁴. The *qdš w amrr* represents the presence of his mistress, as providing a light himself for her on the way.

Summary

The 'messenger' theophany is associated with a light symbol in the Ugaritic texts (cf. KTU 1.2 i 22, 31-33). Hence the appearance of the divine messengers is recognised sometimes as frightening. Their fiery theophany expresses their authority received from the sender, and also represents the presence of the sender. It may be comparable with the 'messenger' theophany in Exod 3.1-6. The *qdš w amrr* ('Qadesh-and-Amurr') occurs as a radiant form whilst performing as the lesser deity of Athirat (KTU 1.4 iv 16-17). Thus, he

²¹⁹ It establishes a contrasting structure with *atr* in the next line: *atr bilt ʿnt*, 'Virgin Anat followed' (KTU 1.4 iv 18).

²²⁰ G.R. Driver (1956: 95); Watson (1978: 399; cf. 1992: 227 n. 31).

²²¹ Caquot-Szzyr (1974: 203); Gibson (1978: 59).

²²² Wyatt (2002: 99 n. 124).

²²³ Cf. Sanmartín (1971: 178 n. 29): 'Qadeš beginnt hell zu machen'; thus, to 'illuminate himself'.

²²⁴ Pardee (1997: 259).

represents the presence of the goddess Athirat, supplying a light for her on the way.

Conclusion to Chapter III, Part I

Although diverse titles are used to indicate messenger deities in the Ugaritic texts, implying three other different senses of hierarchical (*glm*, *mlak*), cultic (*ʿnn ilm*), or political (*dll*, *ʿdd*, or *tʿdt*) designations, they all designate their lesser level. Among other anonymous messenger deities, Gupan and Ugar appear as a pair of messengers of Baal. Before departing, the sender usually instructs his messengers. They have to traverse a long distance. Even the lesser deities, functioning as heralds, conform to the diplomatic norm. When they arrive at the destination, they show their homage to the recipient of the message from the sender; and, obeying the ‘messenger formula’, they begin to deliver the message. After they complete their mission, they are commanded by the recipient to leave quickly and go back to the sender. The messenger theophany is associated with a radiant light, which may represent the sender’s presence. It may also frighten the other gods in the pantheon, especially in the context of the divine war.

In this part the role of lesser deities as divine messengers attested in the Hebrew Bible will be investigated. One of the main roles of the lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible is that of 'messengers'²²⁵. Some 'messenger' texts in the Hebrew Bible will be investigated in this research.

1. The Hebrew Titles of Messenger Deities

1.1. Hierarchical Title: *mlak*

Although the expected verbal root, לִאֵךְ, of the term מַלְאֵךְ is not attested in any Hebrew texts, it has been suggested as the noun form (*maqṭal*) with the prefix מ- of the *לִאֵךְ²²⁶, which thus denotes 'messenger'²²⁷. It may be related etymologically to Ug. *mlak*, 'messenger', whose verbal root occurs as *lʔk*, which refers to the sending of messengers or to the delivering of a message²²⁸. Whilst the verbal root *lʔk* is not attested in Hebrew or Aramaic or Akkadian, it is attested in Ugaritic and in the South Semitic languages²²⁹. Due to the absence of its verbal root, Heb. מַלְאֵךְ may be construed as a loan word from another Semitic language, probably borrowed from its Ugaritic cognate, *mlak*²³⁰.

²²⁵ Dillmann (1897: 233) points out that when "angels" (lesser deities) are "executing a duty at the bidding of God", they are designated as מַלְאֲכֵי־יְהוָה.

²²⁶ Mandelkern (1925: 625-6); Meier (1999: 45).

²²⁷ HALOT 585-6; Ph., Aram., *mlʔk*: DNSWI 629; Ug. *mlak*: DUL 546; Ar. *malʔak*: AEL 3007, 3023; and Eth. *mlʔk*: Leslau (1987: 303).

²²⁸ UT §19.1344; WUS no. 1432; and DUL 486-7. Cf. Greenstein (1979: 329-336).

²²⁹ E.g., Ar. *laʔaka*: Hava (1964: 673) and Eth. *laʔaka*: Leslau (1987: 303).

²³⁰ Meier (1999: 45) proposes that the verbal form of this noun may have "disappeared in Hebrew" due to a "semantic overlap with a preferred and less specific term" שָׁלַח, to 'send' (HALOT 1511-6); therefore, it is replaced by the more frequently used verb. However, this is conjectural. It would be better to see it as a borrowed term as in many

Since it has polymorphic usages, it may indicate immortal or mortal beings. In the Hebrew Bible, Heb. מַלְאָךְ refers to either human or divine messengers, as does Ug. *mlak*²³¹. It sometimes indicates a human messenger sent by earthly rulers (Num 20.14; 21.21; Deut 2.26; Judg 11.12-4, 17, 19; 1 Sam 11.4; 1 Kgs 19.2; 20.2, 5, 9; 2 Kgs 19.14; Isa 30.4; 33.7; Ezek 23.40; and Nah 2.14)²³²; since humans could be perceived as messengers dispatched from Yahweh, it applies to his human agents: sc. prophets (Isa 44.26; Hag 1.13), priests (Mal 2.7), and kings (1 Sam 29.9; 2 Sam 14.17, 20; 19.28 [ET 27]). In some biblical narrative passages, it has been difficult to identify which figure this term represents due to its polymorphic usage to indicate either a human or divine messenger (cf. Judg 2.1-4; 5.23; Mal 3.1; and Eccl 5.5)²³³. Hence it may be determined in the context of the text.

In spite of the variety of its usage, however, its basic sense appears explicitly as a 'lesser agent' of a master²³⁴. When it is utilised to refer to a divine 'messenger', it denotes an agent of Yahweh who carries his message or will. It thus indicates the hierarchically subordinate rank of the lesser deities who convey their missions set by Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible²³⁵.

cases of the obvious etymological connection between Ugaritic and Hebrew, rather than as a "natural Hebrew formation". In this case Heb. מַשְׁלַח would be the more "natural Hebrew formation" for the denotation of 'messenger'. However, Heb. מַשְׁלַח does not occur as an agent noun but denotes a 'sending' as a construct noun form; thus, a 'place or a thing to which anything is sent' (Isa 7.25; Deut 15.10, etc.): *GHLOTS* 518.

²³¹ *TDOT* 8: 309-10.

²³² Sometimes human agents who take a mission of espionage are called מַלְאָכִים (Josh 6.17, 25; and also, 7.22).

²³³ In other ancient Near Eastern contexts, the term for divine messenger is used also to indicate a human messenger: Sum. *kin-gi-a* or *sukkal*; Akk. *mār(i) šiprim*; Eg. *wṗwty*; and Eth. *malak*.

²³⁴ Moore (1895: 185) points out that Heb. מַלְאָךְ may be translated as "'agent,' thus making the relation of the word to מַלְאָכָה more obvious".

²³⁵ Cunchillos (1981a: 42).

Thus, as discussed above, the etymological definition of Heb. מלאך denotes only the one who implements a mission as a messenger²³⁶.

Summary

The term מלאך occurs in the Hebrew Bible to indicate the hierarchically lesser rank of messenger deities. As a 'lesser agent' of a master god, it is used to denote a 'divine agent' of Yahweh who conveys his decree.

2. Named Messenger Deity in the Hebrew Bible

In the divine hierarchical structure in the Hebrew Bible, there seems to be a chief-messenger group distinguished between the supreme god Yahweh and other lesser deities: Gabriel, Michael²³⁷, *et al*²³⁸.

2.1. Gabriel

The term גבריאל, which is taken to denote a messenger deity, may be compounded etymologically by two elements: the גבר, 'strong man'²³⁹, and

²³⁶ In LXX, Heb. מלאך has been translated to its equivalent Gk term ἄγγελος, 'messenger'. Most English versions give the translation of the term as 'angel'. In English nuance, however, it connotes an immaterial, supernatural being. In the New Testament texts, ἄγγελος became a generic term that signifies all kind of supernatural assistants of God. Cf. in the Vulgate, the term *angelus* for the divine messenger is distinguished from the noun *nuntius* for the human messenger.

²³⁷ The identity of Michael will be discussed in Chapter IV.

²³⁸ Gabriel and Michael occur in the list of seven archangels in *1 Enoch* 20, with Uriel, Raphael, Raguel, Sariel, and Remiel. Among these archangels Gabriel (Dan 8.16; 9.21) and Michael (Dan 10.13, 21; 12:1) are the only messengers mentioned by name in the Hebrew Bible.

²³⁹ The first element may be derived from Heb. גָּבַר, which possibly originates from the גָּבַר, to 'be strong' (BDB 149; HALOT 175; cf. Akk. *gapāru*, *gapru*, *gabru*: AHw 281; CAD 6), and it denotes "'man as strong' distinguished from woman, children, and non-combatants": BDB 149-50; and cf. Kosmala (1968: 160): the גָּבַר is a "male person who distinguishes himself from others by his strength, or courage, or uprightness, or some other quality".

the אל, 'El', the supreme god's title or name²⁴⁰, which therefore denote altogether a 'strong man of El'²⁴¹. Thus the term may convey the powerful 'warrior'²⁴² function of the lesser deity, although the two explicit biblical references (Dan 8.16; 9.21) show only his 'messenger' or 'interpreter' function of the vision, which conveys the hidden message of the supreme god²⁴³.

In Dan 7.16, a divine being among the lesser deities of Yahweh appears as an interpreter of the vision to Daniel (also, cf. Dan 10)²⁴⁴. Although the name of this figure is not revealed at the time, it may possibly be related to the DN גבריאל, revealed in the later chapters (Dan 8.16; 9.21). In Dan 8.15, he is described as anthropomorphic²⁴⁵:

והנה עמד לפני כמראה גבר And, behold, (the one) standing in front of me *was* like the appearance of a strong man.

²⁴⁰ Collins (1999: 339): it is a "typically archaic theophoric name", which is ended with the "name of the Canaanite god El, who was, of course, identified with Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible". Thus it is an originally West Semitic name: Collins (1993: 337).

²⁴¹ Cf. HALOT 176: (strong) 'man of God'. Differently; 'God has shown Himself strong': Brueggemann (1962: 332); 'God is my strength': G. Davidson (1967: 117); and 'God is my hero/warrior': Fitzmyer (1981: 328); followed by Collins (1993: 336; 1999: 338).

²⁴² Heb. גִּבּוֹר may take a sense of 'physical strength, courage, and valour, on virility and procreative power' (Kosmala, 1968: 162) because Heb. גִּבּוֹר, the variant form of the גִּבּוֹרִים, may denote a 'man for military service', or a 'soldier in combat', or 'someone who performed a heroic act' (Kosmala, 1975: 374). Thus, with this military sense, the מַלְאָכִים of Yahweh may be called גִּבּוֹרֵי כֹחַ, 'Mighty Ones of power' (Ps 103.20): *ibid.*: 375.

²⁴³ For the NT references of Gabriel, identified as the interpreting ἄγγελος, cf. Luke 1.19, 26; but his nature and role are described more variously in some post-biblical references: 1 En 9.1; 40.6; 2 En 21.3 (as an intercessor); 1 En 9.9-10; 54.6 (as a destroyer); 1 En 40.3 (as one of the four presences); 1 En 40.9 (as having all powers); 2 En 24.11 (as sitting at the left hand of God); and 2 En 40.3 (as one of glorious ones of God), etc.

²⁴⁴ Collins (1993: 311). The Aramaic expression מְנַחֵם קַדְמָיָא, 'one of those who were standing' (by the supreme god), may denote their identity as divine attendants and their lesser rank in the divine assembly as the nonverbal indication.

²⁴⁵ Porteous (1965: 127; cf. 154). For discussion of the anthropomorphic description of the divine being, probably Gabriel, at Dan 7.13, see Collins (1993: 304-10).

The context of the passage here signifies the fact that Gabriel has suddenly arrived a little distance away from Daniel after his journey (cf. v. 17: ויבא אצל, 'and he came near')²⁴⁶.

2.2. עיר וקדיש (עירין) 'Watcher²⁴⁷-and-Holy One'

The Aramaic double-barrelled divine name occurs only in Dan 4.10, 20 (cf. 4.14: עירין ... קדישין), in the description about the second dream of King Nebuchadnezzar. The figure with this epithet refers to a divine messenger²⁴⁸ sent from the heavens. Although he is described as pronouncing a sentence (Dan 4.14), it is explicitly stated that it has been made by the Most High (Dan 4.21); thus, his role may be taken here as the messenger or executor of the sentence dictated by the supreme god.

Summary

Some divine messengers, known by their own names, refer to chief-messengers in the hierarchical divine assembly. The נבריאֵל, 'Gabriel', appears as a powerful warrior deity as well as a divine 'messenger' (or 'interpreter'). The עיר וקדיש (עירין), 'Watcher-and-Holy One', occurs also as a divine title for the divine messenger.

²⁴⁶ S.R. Driver (1900: 120).

²⁴⁷ HALOT 1946. The root of Ar. עיר has been referred mostly to either as 'vigil (vigilant)' (LLAVT 125; cf. עירו, 'vigilance': DNWSI 839; see its verbal $\sqrt{\text{ydw}}$) or, most probably, as the Heb. עור, to 'wake, awake, watch' (GHCLOTS 615, 625; HALOT 802-3 [II]). Singular forms of the verbs following the binominal name in the texts indicate the fact that this divine being is a single deity.

²⁴⁸ LXX renders the עיר to ἄγγελος.

3. The Procedure of Divine Messenger Dispatch in the Hebrew Bible

The procedure of the divine 'messenger' dispatch in the Hebrew Bible will be divided into four: the sending of messengers (1 Kgs 22.22b; Ps 78.49; also in the book of Daniel); the travelling of messengers; the arrival of messengers; and the delivering of the message.

3.1. The Sending of Messengers

The procedure of calling and sending of divine messengers is not often found in the Hebrew Bible. But it can be glimpsed in some biblical descriptions:

3.1.1. 1 Kings 22.22b

The text runs:

וַיֹּאמֶר תַּפְתָּהּ וְגַם תִּוְכַל צֵא וַעֲשֵׂה כֵן

Then he (sc. Yahweh) said 'You shall entice (him) and also you shall prevail (over him); go and do so'.

Suggesting a tactic to Yahweh, a lesser deity comes to him as a volunteer to carry out the plan (cf. 1 Kgs 22.19-22; || 2 Chr 18.18-21). It may be perceived from the text that the sender's instruction to the lesser deity precedes the departure of the lesser deity. Although this deceitful 'spirit' (הַרוּחַ, in v. 21) is not identified as a 'messenger', it is noteworthy in that the text gives the description of how Yahweh commissions and dispatches his agent deity.

3.1.2. Psalm 78.49

The text refers to the dispatch of the band of divine messengers:

יִשְׁלַח בָּם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ עֲבֵרָה וְזַעַם וְצָרָה מִשְׁלַחַת מַלְאֲכֵי רָעִים

He sent upon them anger (out of) his nose²⁴⁹, fury, and wrath,
and distress, a mission²⁵⁰ of evil messengers.

In the Hebrew Bible, Heb. שלח is related closely to the dispatch of divine messengers. The Piel form of the verbal √שלח is used here, and may set up the submissive position of divine messengers to their sender. Keel points out that the messengers are identified as 'emissaries of Yahweh'²⁵¹, dispatched against the Egyptians (cf. Exod 12.23).

3.1.3. The Book of Daniel

In the text of Dan 3.28, Aram. שלח is used for the dispatch of messengers: די שלח מלאכה, '(God) who sent his messenger'. Thus, it may have been a belief that the involvement of a divine messenger is allowed for the mission of deliverance of those who trust in Yahweh in their time of crisis. In the Aramaic passage of Dan 6.23 it is also described: אלהי-שלח מלאכה, 'My God sent his messenger' (also, cf. the usage of the Heb. √שלח at Dan 10.11).

3.2. The Travelling of Messengers

In Hebrew descriptions, divine messengers are recognized as travelling by flight. Gabriel, the divine messenger, is addressed as being able to fly quickly

²⁴⁹ The construction of the two nouns may express the relation of the cause and the effect resulting from it (cf. CHALOT 116). It may allow a possible interpretation of Yahweh pictured as being rageful like a bull breathing from his nostrils.

²⁵⁰ Heb. משלחת, derived from the √שלח, literally denotes a 'sending'. It has been interpreted as a 'host, band' (of angels): HCLOT 518; Tate (1990: 279, 283); 'detachment': NJB; Tate (*ibid.*: 283); 'escort' (Dahood, 1966-70: [2] 237); and 'envoyant' (Jacquet, 1977: 517). Yet it is more appropriate to translate it as their 'mission' (cf. Exod 12:23): Weber (1968: 332 and n. 49); Murphy (1875: 422); and Dahood (*ibid.*: 244).

²⁵¹ Keel (1978: 84). He also compares these messenger deities with 'Canaanite demons' and the 'sickness-demons' of Mesopotamia.

in Dan 9.21. The expression *מַעַף בִּיעָף*, 'being sent in flight'²⁵², may denote the flying function of Gabriel; thus, he may be viewed as a winged figure.

The divine messenger might arrive after a delay. In Dan 10.11 the Heb. *שָׁלַח* is utilised to introduce the messenger's identity to the recipient of the message: *כִּי עַתָּה שָׁלַחְתִּי אֵלֶיךָ*, 'for now²⁵³ I have been sent²⁵⁴ to you' (cf. Dan 9.22). After that, Dan 10.13-14 illustrates the reason for the messenger's delay of three weeks between his departure and arrival; the messenger himself explains that the delay had occurred due to the divine resistance of the anonymous national god of Persia²⁵⁵.

3.3. The Arrival of Messengers

When divine messengers arrive at their destination, they do not express their homage to the recipients unlike the divine messengers in the Ugaritic texts above, since the recipients are all mortals, ranking below the divine messengers (Ps 8.6).

²⁵² Lit. 'being caused to fly in flight'. The first term has been regarded as a Hophal, ptc. form of the *שָׁלַח*, to 'be fatigued, wearied out'; thus, with the second term, it may indicate 'wearied in flight': *GHLOTS* 357; or both terms have been referred to the *שָׁלַח*, to 'be weary with weariness' (*BDB* 419; but *Brown-Driver-Briggs* imply Gabriel's flying function, saying "utterly weary [from winged flight]"); or, 'came ... in my extreme weariness' (*NASB*). However, it is related, more plausibly, to the *שָׁלַח*, to 'fly': *CHALOT* 268; *GHLOTS* 614. Thus, the majority of translations render to: 'was sent forth in flight' (*NJPS*); 'came... in swift flight' (*RSV*; *NRSV*; and *NIV*); 'swooped... in full flight' (*NJB*); 'came in rapid flight' (*NAB*); and 'being caused to fly swiftly' (*ASV*; *KJV*).

²⁵³ Heb. *עַתָּה*, 'now, at this time': *BDB* 773-4; *HALOT* 901-2. The term may be put here in order to explain the reason for the messenger's delay which resulted from the event that has occurred in the following passages (Dan 10:12-4).

²⁵⁴ The Pual, pf. form of the *שָׁלַח* may indicate the subordinate position of the divine messenger (probably, Gabriel) to his sender.

²⁵⁵ For further discussion of the national god or 'patron angel', see Porteous (1965: 152-4), Cf. Deut 32.8-9; Ps 82.6-7.

3.4. The Delivering of the Message

Whilst there is an obvious distinction between the divine messengers and the sender in the Ugaritic texts, it is sometimes unclear in the Hebrew Bible whether the messenger is the sender himself.

3.4.1. First Person Speech of the Messenger

In the episode of Hagar, the messenger is identified apparently with his sender; hence, the מלאך יהוה speaks as if Yahweh speaks (Gen 16.10); and Hagar names him 'El Roi' (v. 13):

וַתִּקְרָא שֵׁם יְהוָה הַדֹּבֵר אֵלֶיהָ
of Yahweh²⁵⁶ (to) the one who is
speaking to her, (saying):

“You are El Roi”²⁵⁷.²⁵⁸ אַתָּה אֵל רֹאִי

²⁵⁶ Wyatt (1994a: 143 n. 3) interprets that Heb. יהוה is superfluously loaded at this place; thus the original text probably was read without it.

²⁵⁷ The second element of the אֵל רֹאִי has been construed as a noun: BDB 909; Skinner (1910: 288); or as a Q. ptc. with a 1. sg. suffix of object: Westermann (1984-6: [2] 234, 247). Yet it may be explained, most probably, as an act. ptc.: thus, 'a God of seeing'/'The God who sees': Dillmann (1897: 73); S.R. Driver (1909: 183); Gibson (1981-2: [2] 61, 62); or 'seeing El'/'El who sees': Wyatt (1994a: 143) argues that it is employed "adjectivally, but absolute sense", suggesting the final -y as an 'archaic or archaising equivalent to the -h'. For another possibility to translate the רֹאִי, he also suggests "whom I see" or "seen", which is taken as a "qatul passive ptc." and which denotes "Hagar's amazement at surviving a vision of a deity" (*ibid.*, 143; 151). Gibson (*ibid.*, 62) points out that El Roi 'was probably already a familiar name to Abraham's family and clan', as well as other epithets such as El Elyon (Gen 14.18), El Shaddai (Gen 17.1), El Olam (Gen 21.33), El Bethel (Gen 31.13, 35.7), and El Elohe Israel (Gen 33.20).

²⁵⁸ Wyatt (1994a: 145-7) reasonably relates the text to the phraseologies in Gen 16.11 (הִנֵּנִי הָרָה וְיֹלְדָה בֵּן וְקִרְאתָ שְׁמוֹ יִשְׁמָעֵאל, 'Lo, you have conceived and are bearing a son, and you shall give him the name Ishmael' [*ibid.*, 146]) and in the Immanuel prophecy in Isa 7.14 ('with the sole addition of one word [הַעֲלֵמָה], and a shift from second to third person') for the royal ideological motif; and further to the Ugaritic text (KTU 1.24.7: *hl glmt tld bn*, 'the sacred bride bore a son'; cf. Wyatt, 2002: 337).

It is explicitly stated that the speaker was the divine messenger himself rather than the sender (cf. Gen 16.7-12; 21.17-8)²⁵⁹. The first person speech of the divine messenger whilst delivering the message of the sender may cause the mortals to perceive him as the sender²⁶⁰. The same occurs in other cases of the speech of the מלאך יהוה: Gen 22.12²⁶¹, 16²⁶², 17²⁶³, and 18²⁶⁴, etc. Although the messenger of Yahweh is recognised apparently as the sender in the Hebrew Bible, it is obviously the divine messenger himself who appears before a mortal (cf. Gen 31.11-3). Thus, the 'first person' speech of the divine messengers can be understood as a delivering technique. The messenger of Yahweh can be perceived as the agent deity charged by the sender, as attested in the Ugaritic texts²⁶⁵.

²⁵⁹ In v. 7, the מַצֵּא underlines the divine messenger's endeavour to contact a mortal, denoting to 'come to, attain to, arrive at' (*HCLOT* 499); and to 'find' with an idea of attaining to (*BDB* 592). The term alludes to the divine messenger's travelling, before initiating his mission to her. It therefore supports the fact that it was the 'messenger' of Yahweh who contacts her to convey the message.

²⁶⁰ Wyatt (1994a: 147) comments interestingly on this: "in the final form of the Hagar narrative, it is an angel of Yahweh which conveys the divine message, but Hagar sees a god. Just as Yahweh is secondary to the story – the child's name requires *yīšmaʿ ʿel* in v 13, not *yīšmaʿ yhw* of MT – so is the angel. Originally El himself appeared".

²⁶¹ In the description, the מלאך יהוה says את יחידך ממני, 'and you have not withheld your son, your only one, from me'.

²⁶² Cf. נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי, 'by myself I have sworn'.

²⁶³ The text suggests two terms for this: בָּרַךְ אֲבָרְכֶךָ, '(in) blessing I will bless you' (the second term: the Piel, impf. 1. sg. form of the בָּרַךְ, with the suffix of 2. masc. sg., meaning to 'bless': *HALOT* 159-60); and וְהִרְבֵּה אֲרִבֶּה, 'and (in) increasing I will increase' (the main verb: the H. impf. 1. sg. form of the רָבַה, denoting to 'make numerous, increase': *HALOT* 1176-8).

²⁶⁴ See שָׁמַעַת בְּקוֹלִי, 'you have obeyed my voice'.

²⁶⁵ The episode of Hagar has been studied with a comparison to the Ugaritic theogonic texts (sc. KTU 1.12 and 1.23): Ginsberg (1936c: 141 n. 5) and Wyatt (1994a). In both descriptions the desert appears as the locale of the birth of the offspring: Wyatt (*ibid.*: 144; 148). For the significance of this Ugaritic and biblical motif, see Wyatt (1987a). For the connection of the motif in KTU 1.23 with the story of Lot's daughters in Genesis, cf. Porter (1978).

Summary

The procedure of the divine 'messenger' dispatch in the Hebrew Bible is described in a similar manner to the Ugaritic formula of the divine 'messenger' dispatch. Hence, Yahweh sends his messengers (1 Kgs 22.22b; Ps 78.49; Dan 3.28; 6.23); they traverse by flying (Dan 9.21); yet, they do not render homage to a recipient when they arrive for the recipients are all humans, ranked lesser than the divine messengers (Ps 8.6); whilst they deliver the message of Yahweh they speak in the first person, as if the sender speaks (Gen 16.10; 22.12, 16, 17, and 18, etc.). It appears that the biblical and Ugaritic traditions conform to a common pattern in the procedure of the divine 'messenger' dispatch.

4. Messenger Theophany in the Hebrew Bible

In the Hebrew Bible the theophany of messengers is accompanied with particular phenomena: lights, clouds, or winds, which may symbolise the presence of the sender (cf. Exod 3.1-6; 14.19; Judg 6.11-24; 13.20a; and Ps 104.4).

4.1. Exodus 3.2

The final form of the text describes the luminous theophany of the messenger in a way not so remote from that of the messengers in the Ugaritic tablets (KTU 1.2 i 31-33):

וירא מלאך יהוה אליו בלבת אש מחוך הסנה

Then the messenger of Yahweh appeared to him as²⁶⁶ a blazing fire²⁶⁷ from the midst of the bush.

²⁶⁶ The preposition כ of the phrase בלבת אש is taken as the *Beth essentiae* at this place: it is translated in the sense of 'as' rather than 'in' after the idea of appearing, manifesting oneself, representing, or being: e.g., באל שרי, 'as El Shaddai', at Exod 6.3; בריח ניחח, 'as a pleasing odour', at Ezek 20.41. See Kautzsch (1910: §119; 3.g, b.1); BDB 88-9. For this

And he looked, and behold, the bush was burning with fire,
yet the bush was not consumed

(Exod 3.2).

The first encounter of the messenger of Yahweh with Moses is distinguished by his mythological theophany: the messenger appears 'as a blazing fire' (אֵשׁ בֹּלֶכֶת) at Horeb (Exod 3.1). This divine messenger can be construed no doubt as a bright figure like the blazing messengers in the Ugaritic text. In the preceding lines of KTU 1.2 i 31-32 and KTU 1.4 iv 16-7, the tablets describe how the messengers appeared²⁶⁸.

In the Hebrew Bible lightning is a primary symbol of the theophany of Yahweh (Ps 77.19 [ET 18]) and a sign of his guidance of his people (Exod 13.21-22; 14.24; Num 14.14; Neh 9.12, 19). Light is mentioned often as a description of Yahweh's countenance (Ps 4.6; Exod 33.17-23; 34.29-35). Thus a human being may feel fear before the lightning presence of a deity. The theophanic imagery of the messenger in a fiery form implies 'cultic ideas and the associations of the sanctuary'; it inevitably evokes the sanctuary in the temple: for instance, a pillar of fire can be regarded as the cultic lampstands,

translation, cf. Childs (1974: 50); Gispén (1982: 51); Garr (1992: 387); M.S. Smith (1994: 306); and Niehaus (1995: 187). The translation supports here the idea that the messenger appears as a fiery theophanic figure himself to represent the presence of Yahweh.

²⁶⁷ The אֵשׁ בֹּלֶכֶת; lit., 'a flame of a fire'. Brown-Driver-Briggs (*BDB*) suggest that Heb. לֶכֶת is a contract form of the Heb. לִהְבֹּחַ, 'flame'. The אֵשׁ בֹּלֶכֶת does not necessarily have to be translated here as 'a flame of fire'. Followed by the אֵשׁ, it has a nuance of 'a flame of lightning'; thus, 'blazing'. The final consonant ך of the first term may be dropped off from the main Semitic root: Ug. *išt* (*DUL* 119-20); Akk. *išātu* (*AHW* 392-3; *CAD* 7[I/J] 227-33).

²⁶⁸ It may be a reason for the event that when the messengers of Yam threatened the divine assembly, El was cowed along with all the other gods with the exception of Baal (KTU 1.2 i).

the מנרה, of the temple (cf. Judg 13.6, 20)²⁶⁹. At any rate, the fiery imagery of the divine messenger may be related closely to the cult; it may also represent the presence of the sender.

4.2. Exodus 14.19

As described above, Ug. *ʿnn* is identified with lesser deities who perform a 'messenger' function. If the 'cloud' can signify the messenger gods in one place, it may do so in another as well. Hence, the identification between 'clouds' and 'messengers' in the Ugaritic texts is also found in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, the messenger of Yahweh makes himself conspicuous in Exod 14.19:

ויסע מלאך האלהים ההלך לפני מחנה ישראל

Then the messenger of the God, who was going before the
camp of Israel, moved²⁷⁰;

וילך מאחריהם

and he went behind them;

ויסע עמוד הענן מפניהם ויעמד מאחריהם

and the pillar of the cloud moved from their front and stood
behind them.

The text describes how the pillar of cloud, having been hitherto in front of the Israelites, moved simultaneously with the messenger of Yahweh and now took its place behind them. In doing so, the pillar of cloud stood as a barrier against the attack on the fugitives by the Egyptians, who came in

²⁶⁹ Wyatt (1986b: 363-4). Mendenhall (1973: 60 n. 67) remarks that the 'tradition that the flame on the altar is a god, or a manifestation of a god, is very old and very widespread' in ancient Semitic world.

²⁷⁰ Heb. נסע may be a technical term used for tent-pegs: to 'pull out or up (a city-gate, tent-pegs), set out, journey': *BDB* 652; *HALOT* 704; or, to 'move': Cassuto (1967: 166); and major translations (NJPS; NRSV; NKJV; and NASB). A cultic nuance may be embedded in a motion of the messenger. The pillar of the clouds here may be seen metaphorically as a peg of the tent (temple).

pursuit (v. 20). Hence, it is apparent that the cloud is identified with the messenger in its movement²⁷¹.

In the Hebrew Bible, the theophanic cloud may be related to the smoke in the sanctuary²⁷²: Yahweh spoke to Moses from above the atonement cover (Num 7.89); thus, he was speaking from the burning incense; and he manifested himself in the smoke filling the temple (Isa 6.4). In this point, the pillar of cloud may be said to be the manifestation of Yahweh descending, staying, and speaking in the tent (Exod 33.9). Hence, it is described as one of the guides of the Israelites in the desert, with the ark (Num 10.33-36) and Hobab (Num 10.31)²⁷³. Thus, Exod 13.21-22 illustrates that Yahweh went forward before the Israelites by day 'in a pillar of cloud' (בַּעֲמֹד עָנָן), and by night 'in a pillar of fire' (בַּעֲמֹד אֵשׁ).

Consequently, it may be said that the theophanic 'cloud' (עָנָן) is associated metaphorically with smoke in the temple. The burning fragrant incense or smoke from the altar may have been the first manifestation in the temple, and then referred to as the pillar of cloud (Exod 30.6 ff.). The pillar is derived perhaps from the lamps (Exod 30.7-8). The cloud and fire is reminiscent of the covenant oath ceremony (a smoking oven and a flaming torch) in Gen 15.18. These symbols may also be related to the cultic lampstands, הַנֵּרוֹת, in the sanctuary (Exod 30.7-8). With this 'smoke' imagery, the עָנָן may be identified as Yahweh's divine messenger who represents the

²⁷¹ Thus, Noth (1962: 115) comments that "so therefore the 'angel of God' was a form which the Egyptians too could see and respect". Whilst the messenger represents the presence of Yahweh, he is regarded as a "supreme angelic leader", not "separate from God, but rather of God himself as he made himself known to men": Clements (1972: 87). He is still placed in a position of an agent deity charged by the sender.

²⁷² E.g., Lev 16.2, 13. Cf. de Moor (1997: 338-9).

²⁷³ Cf. S.R. Driver (1911: 247); Davies (1967: 190).

presence of Yahweh, as Ug. *ʿnn* is used to indicate messenger deities of Baal, Athirat, or maybe El in the Ugaritic texts²⁷⁴.

According to Mendenhall, the ענן in Exod 14.19 represents the mask²⁷⁵ of Yahweh; the מלאך and ענן, hence, share the 'same tradition/conception'. Thus, 'both refer to the manifestations by which a deity becomes functional in human experience'²⁷⁶. Against Mendenhall's view that the ענן may be seen as a form of a deity, Cross disputes that the ענן is a designation of the 'storm cloud' of Yahweh, the storm rider²⁷⁷; Yahweh drives it as a chariot as Baal does²⁷⁸. Yet, there is no reason to refer Heb. ענן only to the 'storm cloud'.

Furthermore, it is not convincing that Ug. *ʿnn* is used for the 'storm cloud' of the storm god Baal since it also occurs to indicate a lesser deity of another "non-storm" goddess Athirat in the Ugaritic texts. Ug. *ʿrp*²⁷⁹ may be better associated to describe the theophany of Baal as the storm god (cf. KTU 1.4 v 9; vii 28). Hence, Baal is often called *rkb ʿrpt*, the 'Charioteer'²⁸⁰ of the Clouds²⁸¹.

²⁷⁴ Mendenhall (1973: 56) points out that Ug. *ʿnn* is a substitute for the names of the divine beings or an 'aspect of their person'.

²⁷⁵ Mendenhall (1973: 59) argues that the ענן has an analogy to Akk. *melammū*. For further discussion with its meaning, see Mendenhall (*ibid.*: 52-3).

²⁷⁶ Mendenhall (1973: 59).

²⁷⁷ Cross (1973: 164-6).

²⁷⁸ Whilst Wyatt (1992a: 421-2) understands the *ʿnn* as Baal's assistant deities (Gupan and Ugar), he also argues that 'given the use of *ʿnn* in theophany language in such passage as Exod. 13.21 f., 14.20, 34.5, Job 37.15, and so forth, we are entitled to see the same lexeme in connection with the weather-god'.

²⁷⁹ Ug. *ʿrp*, 'storm cloud': DUL 184 (II). Cf. Akk. *urpu*: AHw 1432.

²⁸⁰ The first element of the epithet may be construed as an act. ptc. form of the \sqrt{rkb} , to 'mount' (a chariot), denoting 'charioteer' (DUL 739-40; Wyatt, 1988: 376; 1992a: 420-2), rather than 'rider' (Gibson, 1978: 51). Thus, the *ʿrpt* may indicate the divine chariot itself: Wyatt (2002: 65 n. 136).

²⁸¹ Cf. KTU 1.2 iv 8, 29; 1.3 ii 40; 1.3 iii 38; 1.3 iv 4, 6; 1.4 iii 11, 18; 1.4 v 60; 1.5 ii 7; 1.10 i 7; 1.10 iii 36; 1.19 i 43; and 1.92.37, 40.

Therefore, it may represent a divinised 'smoke', identified with the divine messenger as at Exod 14.19. On these ground, Clifford understands that the 'cloud' of Yahweh remains as a demythologized remnant from Ugaritic mythology in which Ug. *ʿnn* had been used to indicate 'messenger deities'²⁸². Thus, it is possible to admit to the veracity of Mendenhall's suggestion that the pillar of cloud seems here to be identical with the messenger of Yahweh through the theophanic manifestation of the lesser deities. They both represent the theophany of Yahweh in their simultaneous movement.

4.3. Judges 6.11-24

The theophany of the מלאך יהוה described in Judg 6.11-24 is related to the symbolism of light. Whilst it is stated that the מלאך יהוה encountered Gideon (vv. 11-12), it is also said that the יהוה turned to him (v. 14)²⁸³. In the plot, the messenger speaks as if Yahweh speaks (v. 16²⁸⁴ but in v. 20 it is the מלאך יהוה who has spoken to him; also, cf. v. 21). Hence, some have identified the messenger with Yahweh²⁸⁵. The lamentation of Gideon to Yahweh, however, makes a clear distinction between Yahweh and his agent deity (v. 22); the מלאך יהוה is perceived as an entity distinct from Yahweh, but who represents his presence.

²⁸² Clifford (1972: 112, 125): "In Ugaritic, *ʿnn* is the messenger(s) of the gods, evidently the divinized cloud in their entourage". For a further discussion on the connection between Ug. *ʿnn* and Heb. עֵנַן, cf. Mann (1971; 1977: 96, 130-143).

²⁸³ Terminological disagreement reminds us of the encounter of Moses with the 'messenger of Yahweh', who was called also 'Yahweh' (cf. Exod 3.2, 4).

²⁸⁴ In the vv. 14 and 16, whilst MT reads the subjects of the verbs as יהוה, LXX takes them as ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου, 'the messenger of the lord', which presupposes מלאך יהוה, and which emphasises the fact that he was the messenger rather than Yahweh himself.

²⁸⁵ Thus, Moore (1895: 185-6) argued that 'the messenger is Yahweh himself'; and Soggin (1981) interpreted that he is a 'being who is interchangeable with Yahweh, identical to him, and does not exist in a separate from, being his visible manifestation'.

In vv. 20-21, the messenger brings a staff, which lights a fire and springs up from the rock, to consume the meat and the unleavened bread that Gideon set up for him. Thus the event describes the theophany of the messenger associated with the light symbol. The description has a cultic background (cf. Exod 3.2-6).

4.4. Judges 13.20a

The theophany of the מלאך יהוה is climaxed, finally, by his ascent toward the heavens as a flaming figure:

ויהי בעלות הלהב מעל המזבח השמימה ויעל מלאך יהוה בלהב
המזבח

And it came to pass, as²⁸⁶ the flame was going up from upon the altar toward the heavens, that the messenger of Yahweh ascended in the flame of the altar.

The messenger's fiery ascent in the scene reminds us of a similar story in the previous passages of Judges; the rock in Judg 6.20-1 became the altar here.

4.5. Psalm 104.4

The radiant light is often used to describe the theophany of Yahweh, as described above. It can be also connected with other theophanic disclosures by divine messengers. The text of Ps 104.4 describes:

עשה מלאכיו רוחות משרתיו אש להט

He makes his messengers²⁸⁷ winds²⁸⁸, his servants the flaming²⁸⁹ fire²⁹⁰.

²⁸⁶ The preposition ב may be read here as the *Beth essentiae*: Niehaus (1995: 242).

²⁸⁷ LXX reads the text as 'ἀγγέλους'.

²⁸⁸ The pl. form of the noun רוח, 'breath, wind, or spirit': HALOT 1197-2001. It is preferably taken here as the meaning of 'wind', rather than 'spirit' (LXX).

²⁸⁹ The ptc. masc. sg. form of the להט, to 'blaze up, flame': HALOT 521. The structure of the two terms, the אש and the להט, has been construed variously: as two terms

The מלאך seems more likely to indicate divine 'messengers' here²⁹¹. The מלאך and the שרת are paralleled to denote the lesser deities and thus the following terms, the רוח and the אש, are described also as a parallelism to indicate their theophany²⁹².

The theophanic characteristic of the lesser deities may appear also as 'winds' which may express their moving operation. In 1 Kgs 22.21, the רוח is taken as a lesser deity. The radiant theophany of divine messengers is also found in the Ugaritic texts (cf. KTU 1.2 i 32). Dahood argues that "Originally two minor divinities in the Canaanite pantheon, 'fire and flame' have been demythologized and reduced to servitors of Yahweh"²⁹³. Yet there is no clue that the text has been "demythologised". At any rate, the text shares a light symbol with regard to the theophany of lesser deities in the Ugaritic mythological texts.

Summary

The theophany of messengers in the Hebrew Bible is associated with natural phenomena; especially lights, which signify the presence of the sender (Exod 3.2; Judg 6.11-24; 13.20a), similar to the Ugaritic 'messenger' theophany (KTU

with asyndeton (Dahood, 1966-70: [3] 35: thus, 'fire and flame'); or as a plural subject and a plural predicate (Allen, 1983: 37). However, it may be best understood as a participle modifying the noun: a 'fire which is flaming' in a literal sense. Thus, it may describe the theophany of the lesser deity itself (cf. Exod 3.2).

²⁹⁰ Whilst it is translated as 'He makes the winds His messengers, fiery flames His servants' (NJPS; and similarly, NASB; NIV; NRSV; and NJB), LXX takes its opposite order, i.e., as putting the 'messengers' (angels) first before the other term, more understandably: hence, ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον, 'Who is making his messengers spirits, and his servants a flaming fire' (cf. KJV and Heb 1.7). Thus, it may give a clearer understanding of the theophanic characteristic of messengers.

²⁹¹ Holladay (1993: 125).

²⁹² Cf. Miller (1965: 257; 1973: 31). Habel (1985: 538) identifies these divine beings with the Sons of God and Stars at Job 38.7.

²⁹³ Dahood (1966-70: [3] 35).

1.2 i 31-32; 1.4 iv 16-7). The radiant theophanic imagery of messengers is related to cultic ideas from the sanctuary: e.g. the מנרת of the temple as a pillar of fire (Judg 13.6, 20). The theophany of messengers is allied also with clouds (Exod 14.19), which is related to the smoke in the temple (Isa 6.4) as well as to the winds (Ps 104.4).

Conclusion to Chapter III

As discussed in the Ugaritic texts above, a range of the divine titles is applied to the substance of divine messengers. These various terms indicate diverse and crucial roles of messenger deities to mediate between the higher gods in the polytheistic Ugaritic world. Yet these assorted designations are hardly found for the divine messengers in the Hebrew Bible. Instead, it is much simplified, with the מלאך to denote divine messengers sent to humans, regardless of their various roles in the texts.

The theophany of messengers in the Hebrew Bible is described similarly to the radiant theophany of divine messengers illustrated in the Ugaritic text (KTU 1.2 i 31-32; KTU 1.4 iv 16-7). In some biblical narratives, their theophany accompanied with lights is such that it is enough to make the people frightened, for it contains the presence of the sender. It is confirmed also that their fiery theophany is related concretely to the presence of Yahweh.

CHAPTER FOUR:

Warrior Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible

Introduction

This chapter will scrutinise the role of lesser deities as divine warriors in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible. The research will explore any important Ugaritic or Hebrew terms that represent 'warrior deities'¹, and will then examine some selected Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew texts relevant to their warrior role in the context of the divine war, by philological and textual analysis².

Among warrior deities, some have been known according to their names in the Ugaritic texts: Qadesh-and-Amurr and Yatipan; in the biblical Hebrew texts, Michael is one case. The research will discuss the identity of these named warrior deities.

¹ Any Ugaritic titles indicating 'divine warriors' in the Ugaritic texts shall be examined in Part I of the chapter: hence, *ib*; *il t^cdr*; *'nn*; *glm*; *hnzr*; *mhr*; *mḥš*; and *rpu(m)*. In Part II, Hebrew titles for warrior deities will be selected, for the examination, mainly from the lists made by Fredriksson (1945: 9-67): thus, אֲבִירִים, גְּבָרִים, צַבָּאוֹת, מַשְׁחִית (אלהים), מַחֲנֶה (יהוה); מִשְׁחָתִים; מֵלֶאךָ, etc.

² Some Ugaritic texts relevant to the issue will be investigated in Part I of the chapter: KTU 1.5 v 6-9; 1.5 iv 8-14, etc. In Part II, some biblical Hebrew texts will be examined as well: Judg 5.20; 2 Kgs 19.35a; Ps 68.18, etc.

PART I. Warrior Deities in the Ugaritic Texts

In this part, the research will survey some Ugaritic terms for warrior deities that occur in the Ugaritic texts. In addition, the identity of the named warrior deities will be examined.

1. The Ugaritic Titles for Warrior Deities

In the Ugaritic myth of the divine conflict between the secondary gods (Baal, Yam, Mot, *et al.*) it remains unclear, at the most crucial point in the drama, whether or not lesser deities have participated in the divine war. However, their participation in the divine warfare may be inferred from their epithets or titles and in the context of the events in the texts.

In the Ugaritic texts, some lesser deities appear as being related to the divine warfare between the higher gods. For our enquiry on their role as 'warrior deities', it is necessary, first of all, to look into any terms which may be used to denote their role in such contexts. The Ugaritic titles for lesser deities who take a warrior role are designated variously in the Ugaritic texts. These diverse titles determine their identity as warrior deities.

1.1. *ib* 'Enemies'

Baal is depicted as fighting against his enemies in the Ugaritic texts³. The designation *ib b'q/hd[[x]]t*, 'enemies⁴ of Baal/Hadd⁵' (KTU 1.4 vii 35-7) may

³ Especially Baal's battle with Yam in KTU 1.2 iv 1-32; and his quarrel with Litan (*ltn*) in KTU 1.5 i 1-3; 27-30; thus, once Mot acknowledges the power of Baal that killed even the powerful monster (KTU 1.5 i 1-3; 27-30), even though Baal did indeed kill the monster, Mot declares that he will kill Baal (KTU 1.5 i 4-8). Litan has been seen as one of the chief-warriors of Mot in the battle against the forces of Baal: Dussaud (1938: 146). However, the supporting texts for this reference are not found elsewhere in the Ugaritic texts. Moreover, the obsequious reply of Baal to Mot in KTU 1.5 ii makes it harder to accept the interpretation that he killed the 'chief-warrior' of Mot. Differently, del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 507) suggest

denote his rival gods and also their assistant (warrior) deities, in the same way as Baal himself is identified by his warrior deities.

KTU 1.3 iii describes how, when Anat saw Gupan and Ugar, the messengers of Baal, coming, she assumed there was another conflict of Baal with his enemies (*ib*⁶), and wondered who would be arising against him now since she had destroyed all of his enemies (KTU 1.3 iii 36-8). Here a group of enemies against Baal is revealed as having been defeated already by Anat (KTU 1.3 iii 38-46). Their names are known here: Yam (*ym*), Nahar (*nhr*), Dragon (*tnn*), Serpent (*bṭn*), Encircler-with-seven heads (*šlyt d šbʿt rašm*)⁷, Arsh (*arš*), Atik (*ʿtk*), Fire (*išt*), and Flame (*dḫb*)⁸. They have been construed as “the god sea and a host of monsters allied to him”⁹.

that Litan may be a “monster that collaborates with or personifies Yam”. Even if he cooperates primarily with Yam, Litan does not seem to be a lesser deity belonging to Yam, but a sea monster independent from any other gods.

⁴ Ug. *ib*, ‘enemy’: DUL 4 (I). Cf. Heb. אֵיב: HALOT 38-9; Akk. *ay(y)ābu*: AHw 23-4; CAD 1/1[A] 222-4.

⁵ The reading of the damaged text is various: *hdt* (CTA); *hdt* (KTU¹), commenting that the final letter *t* was written over erasure: ‘*t* über Rasur geschrieben’ (n. 5); or *hd*[[x]]*t* (KTU²). Ug. *hd* is suggested as the ‘equivalent of Hadad, Adad (‘thunderer’), epithet of the storm-god’: Wyatt (2002: 110 n. 158; cf. 1992a: 412).

⁶ Cf. KTU 1.3 iii 37; iv 4, 5; 1.4. vii 35, 38; and *passim*, especially in the Ugaritic omen text (KTU 1.103).

⁷ Ug. *šlyt* has been interpreted as ‘tyrant’, an epithet of the *tnn*, ‘dragon’: Watson (1977: 274-5); del Olmo (1981: 629); WUS no. 2612; and DUL 822, referring to Heb. שָׁלִיט (HALOT 1524); Ar. *salīt* (AEL 1406); Akk. *šaltu* (AHw 1151; CAD 17/1[Š] 271). It is also construed as a Š form of the *√lwt* (cf. Heb. לָוֵט, to ‘wrap’: HALOT 523); Gray (1965: 31 n. 3): ‘the close-coiling one’; Margalit (1980: 90); followed by Wyatt (2002: 79 n. 49): thus, ‘Encircler’, arguing that “Dragons frequently encircle treasures which they guard, such as the golden fleece or the golden apples of the Hesperides”. For further discussion of the term, see de Moor (1979: 641 n. 12).

⁸ As a DN: Dahood (1969: 36), relating to Heb. שָׁבִיב (HALOT 1392); Wyatt (2002: 79 n. 53). Also, cf. Watson (1978: 397 and n. 7).

⁹ Loewenstamm (1959: 260).

1.2. *il t^cdr* 'Helper-gods'

The expression *il t^cdr* is found mostly in ritual lists of sacrifices to the gods of the pantheon and appears only to denote the lesser deities of Baal: thus, the *il t^cdr* is followed almost always by the DN *b^l*: hence, 'Helper-gods'¹⁰ of Baal'¹¹. The gods under this designation do not play, apparently, any role in Ugaritic mythological texts, although their title is found in the Ugaritic Pantheon Lists¹².

In the early study of this phrase, Albright proposes two possible translations: the 'Auxiliaries of Baal', comparing it with the Heb. designation עוזרי רהב, the 'helpers of Rahab'¹³ in Job 9.13; or the 'warriors of Baal' for Heb. עור is a loan word from Eg. *u-di-ir*, 'warrior'¹⁴. M.C. Astour surmises that these helper-gods may be equated with the 'seven Lads; eight Boars' in KTU 1.5 v 8-9¹⁵ who descended with Baal into the underworld, probably for

¹⁰ The first element of the expression, Ug. *il*, is construed as a pl. construct noun: de Moor (1970: 198). Ug. *t^cdr*, 'help, protection' (*DUL* 856), occurs here as a sg. construct noun form of the verbal *√t^cdr*, to 'help, rescue' (*DUL* 153).

¹¹ Ug. *il t^cdr b^l*. Cf. 'The gods who help Baal': Wyatt (2002: 362). It occurs in KTU 1.47.26; 1.84.8, [47]; 1.118.25; 1.139.[6]; 1.148.8; 1.176.[12]. The reading of KTU 1.148.33 (= RS 24.643.33) is different: whilst *KTU*² reads the text as [] *gšr š*, *KTU*¹ and Cunchillos-Vita (1995: 2027) restore it as [... *il t^cdr š*. Cf. 1.109.21-22 (= RS 24.253.21-2): whereas *KTU*¹⁺² and Ug 5 (592) take it as *il t^cdr š b^l*, Cunchillos-Vita (1995: 2027) render it to *il t^cdr b^l*.

¹² See KTU 1.47.26 (= KTU 1.118.25); and RS 20.24.25, where the Akkadian divine title *^dilānu^{mes} til-la-ad^d adad* is parallel to the Ugaritic divine title *il t^cdr b^l*, which denotes the helper gods of Baal. Cf. del Olmo (1999: 73); Wyatt (2002: 262). Nougayrol (1968: 57) unconvincingly argues that these entities represent the Babylonian deities Ninegal and Tešup: 'Dans le domaine des cuneiforms babyloniens, on ne peut guère en rapprocher que Ninegal, alliée (?) aussi de Tešup'.

¹³ Rahab is the dragon of chaos, whom Yahweh vanquished in primordial combat (Job 26.12; Ps 89.11; and Isa 51.9). Cf. Albright (1968b: 143 n. 89).

¹⁴ Albright (1934: 38, V.C.1.).

¹⁵ Astour (1966: 280). Wyatt (2002: 362 n. 20) also argues that 'the gods who help Baal' are identified as 'Baal's assistants' who appeared in KTU 1.5 v 8-9.

divine warfare against Mot. Thus, Miller suggests also that they may be divine warriors who went forth with Baal into divine battle¹⁶.

Another less probable possibility would be to see them as the *rpu(m)* 'Rapi'uma'. Nougayrol refers to them as the Rapi'uma or seven Lads (*glm*) of Baal¹⁷, following Virolleaud¹⁸ and Dussaud¹⁹. In any event, it is explicit that the *il t'cdr* occur, with the following DN Baal, as the assistant deities of Baal and that they are recognised as objects of worship in the temple insofar as this expression appears in the ritual texts²⁰. It may be suggested that they are related perhaps to the divine entities of the expression *phr b'l*, 'Group of Baal'²¹, whose identities may be referred to as Baal's seven Lads; eight Boars in KTU 1.5 v 8-9.

1.3. *nn* 'Clouds'

During the divine conflict between Yam and Baal, Yam's messengers delivered his declaration of war against Baal; thus, the messengers demanded Baal's surrender; Baal rejected El's verdict, decided in the divine assembly, that the divine kingship and the sovereignty were given to Yam and he attacked Yam's messengers who were sent to the divine assembly (KTU 1.2 i). The text describes Yam's message that the messengers have delivered:

¹⁶ Miller (1973: 19).

¹⁷ Nougayrol (1968: 57).

¹⁸ Virolleaud (1940: 78).

¹⁹ Dussaud (1941: 185-8).

²⁰ KTU 1.84.8, [47] (the ritual text); 1.109.21-22 (= RS 24.253.21-2); 1.139.[6]; 1.148.8, and 33 (= RS 24.643.33; the list of sacrifices). All texts may have been used for ritual purposes. Also see KTU 1.47.26 (= KTU 1.118.25; RS 20.24.25; the Pantheon Lists) and 1.176.[12] (the mythic text).

²¹ Cf. 1.7. *phr b'l* 'Group of Baal' in Par I of Chapter I.

The identity of the reconstructed ʿnn here has been suggested as ‘Kothar’, ‘who supplies Baal with weapons’²⁵, interpreting ʿnnh as ‘his henchman’²⁶. Yet, as other commentators have rendered it, this may be identified more plausibly as ‘Gupan and Ugar’, Baal’s messengers²⁷, who are called ʿnn ilm as well as ḡlm elsewhere²⁸. The function of Baal’s divine Clouds seems to be discerned here as warriors, rather than as messengers.

1.4. ḡlm ‘Lads’

Baal is said to have his own assistant deities. They are called ḡlm and their number is known as seven:

šbʿt ḡlmk

Your (sc. Baal’s) seven Lads

(KTU 1.5 v 8-9).

In other places, it is described that the god Mot has *eaten* seven deities:

²² The impv. m. sg. form of the √ym, to ‘give, hand over, grant, bestow’: DUL 990-2; ‘give up’: Wyatt (2002: 59). Cf. Heb. יָמַן: HALOT 733-5; Ph. ym: DNWSI 478-80; Akk. nadānu: AHw 701; CAD 11/1[N].

²³ Differently, Gordon (1949: 13): ‘partisans’; Gray (1965: 24 and n. 5): ‘even himself’, although he follows the suggestion of Cassuto (1971: 137): connecting to Ar. ʿanna to ‘present oneself, appear’; but this translation is not acceptable in relation to the other usages of ʿnn: ʿnn ilm (KTU 1.3 iv 32; 1.4 viii 15); ʿnn atrt (KTU 1.4 iv 59), as de Moor (1971: 129-30) and van Zijl (1972: 22) point out; Wyatt (2002: 59, 61): ‘retinue’.

²⁴ Cf. KTU 1.2 i 35.

²⁵ Gaster (1950: 137).

²⁶ For other interpretations, ‘partisans’: Gordon (1949: 13); ‘even himself’: Gray (1965: 24 and n. 5), although he follows Cassuto’s (1971: 137) suggestion, connecting it to Ar. ʿanna to ‘present oneself, appear’; but his translation is not acceptable in relation to other usages of ʿnn: ʿnn ilm (KTU 1.3 iv 32; 1.4 viii 15); ʿnn atrt (KTU 1.4 iv 59), as de Moor (1971: 129-30) and van Zijl (1972: 22) point out; also, ‘retinue’: Wyatt (2002: 59, 61). Cf. van Zijl (1972: 22).

²⁷ Ginsberg (1944: 25-30); de Moor (1971: 129); and Mann (1971: 21).

²⁸ For occurrences of Gupan and Ugar as ʿnn ilm, cf. KTU 1.1 iii [17]; 1.3 iv 32 and 1.4 viii 15.

Since the existing Ugaritic texts do not give further information, it is not clear whether the seven victims were Baal's seven Lads (*ḡlm*) or his Helper-gods (*il tʿdr*). In any case, the context presupposes that Baal's lesser deities have attacked Mot. After the divine warfare, they were eaten by Mot; but he realised that they were his brothers, begotten by the same mother (KTU 1.6 vi 10-11)³⁰. The seven Lads may be regarded as warrior deities here and they may be suggested as *mhr bʿl*, 'warriors of Baal', in other texts (KTU 1.22 i 9; 1.22 ii 7)³¹.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to know what happened before line 8 of 1.6 vi for the tablets are broken. On the basis of the context of the broken texts, it may be inferred that they are related to the military force, to fight against Mot. Mot probably came to Baal at Saphon to fight him, where he ate Baal's seven assistants before his cosmic warfare against him (KTU 1.6 vi 16-22). Also, the term *ḡlm* occurs in KTU 1.169.10, indicating a warrior deity who fights demonic spirits³².

1.5. *ḥnzr* 'Boar'

Ug. *ḥnzr* has been rendered syllabically to *ḥu-zi-rum* or *ḥe-en-ni-šu*³³; and it has been supposed to be an animal name: 'boar'³⁴. Against this theory, Albright

²⁹ De Moor-Spronk (1987: 42).

³⁰ The text reads: *p hn aḥym ytn bʿl spuy bnm umy klyy*, 'and, look, Baal gave (me for) my food, sons of my mother (for) my consumption'.

³¹ For further discussion of Ug. *mhr bʿl*, see below.

³² See further discussion of Ug. *ḡlm* in KTU 1.169.10 in Chapter III.

³³ Nougayrol (1968: 243); sc. *Ug* 5; no. 137 ii 25, 26.

³⁴ Virolleaud (1931: 196); *UT* §19.977; *WUS* no. 1048; and de Moor (1971: 185). Cf. Akk. *ḥuzīru*, 'swine': *AHW* 362; *CAD* 266; Heb. חזיר: *HAOLT* 302. The biform of the term with/without *-n-* is attested in other Semitic languages: Egyptian may have its biform in the case of *Ḥndr* and *Hdr*: W.A. Ward (1961: 34-35). Wyatt (2002: 122 n. 37) interestingly comments that "pigs also featured in the Greek Thesmophoria rites which involved

comments that the definition 'swine' is not the correct sense of Ug. *ḥnṣr*³⁵. However, it appears in a polyglot vocabulary³⁶. Hence, some have suggested that it may be a military title, which seems to be derived from Hurrian³⁷. In this case, its Hurro-Akk. cognate is *ḥanizarru*, which means 'functionary'³⁸; Akk. *ḥāziru*, 'helper', has its variants: *ḥanziru* or *āziru*³⁹. Similarly, Caquot and Sznycer translate it as 'officers'⁴⁰.

In fact, animal names are used metaphorically as titles for warriors⁴¹; thus, Keret summons his military subordinates, whose titles are animal names:

<i>ṣḥ bṣms try</i>	Call my seventy Bulls,
<i>ṭmnym ṣbyy</i>	my eighty Gazelles ⁴²

(KTU 1.15 iv 6-7).

chthonian goddesses, of whom Baal's consorts appear to have been Semitic analogues, if not prototypes". Cf. Harrison (1955: 124-6) and Astour (1969: 14).

³⁵ Albright's initial interpretation as 'boar' (Albright, 1932: 204) has been changed due to its irrelevance to 'swine' (Albright, 1950b: 389); observed by Miller (1970b: 178; 1973: 188 n. 37).

³⁶ Caquot-Sznycer (1974: 247-8 n. g.). It may be used to denote 'labourer' as in KTU 4.141 iii 4-11 (= PRU II: 24 rev. 4-11) and, perhaps, KTU 4.630.2-3 (= PRU V: 52.2-3) and KTU 4.609 left edge (= PRU V: 11 margin). It occurs also as recipients of jars: KTU 4.216.6 (= PRU II: 91.6). Cf. Miller (1970b: 179-80 and n. 15).

³⁷ Laessøe (1959: 83); Løkkegaard in Hvidberg (1962: 26 n. 1); Lipiński (1967a: 39 n. 6); followed by Miller (1970b: 178-80).

³⁸ AHw 321. Cf. Ug. *ḥnṣr* has a meaning of 'assistant': DUL 417-8.

³⁹ Cf. AHw 166-7; CAD 6[H] 166.

⁴⁰ Caquot-Sznycer (1974: 247).

⁴¹ Miller (1970b: 177): "Frequently animal names were used metaphorically as designations or titles for leaders or nobles of some sort or for warriors" in both Ugaritic and Hebrew. The same usage occurs also in Hebrew: אַבִּיר, 'bull, stallion' (1 Sam 21.8; Ps 68.31; Job 24.22, etc.); אֵיל, 'ram' (Exod 15.15; 2 Kgs 24.15; Jer 4.22; Ezek 30.13; Ps 58.2, etc.); כַּפִּיר, 'young lion' (Ezek 38.13; Nah 2.14); עֵזוֹר, 'he-goat' (Isa 14.9; Zech 10.3); צִבִּי, 'gazelle' (2 Sam 1.19; Isa 23.7); and שֹׁר, 'bull' (Gen 49.6), etc. Cf. Miller (*ibid.*: 180-6); Watson (1984: 268).

⁴² Ug. *ṣby*, 'gazelle': Gordon (1949: 76); DUL 1003; Miller (1970b: 178); Watson (1984: 268). Cf. Heb. צִבִּי: HALOT 998. Aram. *ṣṭby*(?) DNWSI 419, 958; Akk. *ṣabītu*: AHw 1071; CAD 42-4. Cf. KTU 1.15 iv 18: *ḥh tšʿrb ṣbyh*, 'to him let her bring his Gazelles'.

The two animal titles above represent without a doubt the characteristics of Keret's military officers⁴³. Consequently, Ug. *hnr* may be used with a military implication in the Ugaritic texts⁴⁴. Thus, it may be interpreted as a military title as well as an animal name.

1.5.1. KTU 1.5 v 6-9

An example of its use as a military title is found in KTU 1.5 v 6-9; Baal's lesser deities are numbered as seven; Mot ordered Baal to descend with his divine assistants to meet him in the underworld:

w at qh ṛptk rḥk mdlk mṛtk ṁk šbṯ ḡlmk tmn hnrk

And, you, take⁴⁵ your clouds, your wind⁴⁶, your lightnings⁴⁷,
your rain⁴⁸, (take) with you your seven Lads, your eight Boars.

Various meteorological symbols are accompanied here with the theophany of Baal; and further, a group of divine assistants are gathered together to follow him. The last phrase *tmn hnrk*, 'your eight Boars', is a parallel with the

⁴³ Hence, Ginsberg (1946: 24, 42): 'peers ... barons', admitting them as literally 'bulls' and 'gazelles'; he points out that they occur in synonymous parallelism. Unconvincingly, Gray (1964a: 62) interprets them as Baal (*try*) and Reshef (*zbyy*). Wyatt (2002: 214) renders the titles to 'commanders ... leaders', signifying their military rank.

⁴⁴ Miller (1970b: 178-80).

⁴⁵ Ug. *lqh*, to 'get hold of, take, grasp, receive, collect, accept, hold, obtain, acquire': DUL 501-3. Cf. לָקַח: HALOT 534-5; Ph., Pun., Moab., Aram. *lqh*: DNWSI 580-4; Akk. *leqû*: AHw 544-6; CAD 9[L] 131-47; Ar. *laqaha*: AEL 2668.

⁴⁶ Ug. *rḥ*, 'gust, breath, wind': DUL 736 (I). Cf. Heb. רוּחַ: HALOT 1197-1201; Pun., Aram. *r(w)h*: DNWSI 1065-6; Syr. *rūhō*: Brockelmann (1966: 718); Ar. *rawḥ, rūḥ, rīḥ*: AEL 1180-1.

⁴⁷ Ug. *mdl* may denote basically the guide 'rope' (attached to the animal's nose), referring to Ar. *dalla*, to 'guide', and Aram. *dallel*, to 'lead': Good (1984: 80-1), interpreting that 'Certainly Baal is the cloud rider, and if the metaphor of the storm deity as rider of the clouds is taken seriously, perhaps his guide rope can be thought of as "lightning"'; followed by Watson (1986: 73-8), who relates it also to Ebla. *ma-da-LUM*; and Wyatt (2002: 124 and n. 42). Differently, 'meteor': DUL 527-8 (II).

⁴⁸ Ug. *mṛ*, 'rain': DUL 603. Cf. Heb. מֵטֶר: HALOT 574-5; Aram. *mṛ*: DNWSI 619.

previous phrase *šbʿt ḡlmk*, ‘your seven Lads’⁴⁹. They both are designated here as Baal’s military officers for the divine warfare against Mot.

1.5.2. KTU 1.5 iv 8-9

Baal’s seven Lads and eight Boars appear also in a cultic situation, as at KTU 1.5 iv 8-9:

ynpʿ bʿ[] Ba[al] appeared⁵⁰ []
b ṭmnt a[] with eight [].

Whilst *KTU*¹ and *CTA* take the first letter following after Ug. *ṭmnt* in line 9 as unrecognised, *KTU*² reads it as ‘a’; de Moor and Spronk reconstruct lines 8 and 9 as follows⁵¹:

ynpʿ bʿ[] bḥdry Ba[al] appeared [in my chamber⁵²]
b ṭmnt a[] p sgrt in the eight en[trances⁵³ of the closed
 rooms⁵⁴]⁵⁵.

However, in the context of the texts, there is no reason that Baal should come from the rooms of Mot if the host of the feast is Mot. It gets harder to understand if the rooms are part of the house of Mot, which may signify the centre of the underworld. Moreover, the plot of the text is difficult to

⁴⁹ Albright (1932: 204) and Miller (1973: 18).

⁵⁰ Ug. *ynpʿ*; a N form of the $\sqrt{ynpʿ}$, to ‘leave, depart, appear, rise, present oneself’: *DUL* 972-3. Cf. Heb. יָצַע: *HALOT* 424; Akk. (w)apû: *AHw* 1459-60; *CAD* 1/2[A] 201-4.

⁵¹ De Moor-Spronk (1987: 33-34).

⁵² Ug. *ḥdr*, with a preposition *b* and 1. sg. suffix, ‘room, chamber’: *DUL* 355. Cf. Heb. חדר: *HALOT* 293; Ph., Pun. *ḥdr*: *DNWSI* 350.

⁵³ Ug. *ap*, ‘nose, muzzle, beak, anger, front, entrance’: *DUL* 87-8 (II): Cf. Heb. אָף: *HALOT* 76-7; Aram. ʿ(n)p: *DNWSI* 83-4; Akk. *appu*: *AHw* 60; *CAD* 1/2[A] 184-9; and Ar. ʿanf: *AEL* 116.

⁵⁴ As a f. noun form, Ug. *sgrt*, ‘room, chamber’ (*DUL* 755), occurs in a parallelism with Ug. *ḥdr*. It is derived from the verbal root *sgr*, to ‘close’ (*DUL* 754).

⁵⁵ Cf. a translation of de Moor (1987: 76): ‘let baʿ[lu] appear [in my chambers], in the eight en[trances of (my) lockable rooms]!’. Dijkstra (1983: 31) restores the text on the basis of *KTU* 1.9 v 10-12.

understand due to its broken condition. But a better reading may be restored on the basis of KTU 1.5 v 8-9 as most commentators suggest⁵⁶:

ynp^c b^c[l šb^ct ġlmh] Ba[al] appeared [*with*⁵⁷ his seven Lads]
b tmnt [ħnzrh] with [his] eight [Boars]

Thus, the gods in the banquet of Mot may be regarded as Baal and his assistant deities: Lads and Boars.

The first phrase *šb^ct ġlmk/h*, ‘your/his seven Lads’, has a numeral sequence with the next phrase *tmn(t) ħnzrk/h*, ‘your/his eight Boars’ (KTU 1.5 v 8-9 and 1.5 iv 8-9). The typical formula, using the number sequence of ‘n. || n. + 1’ in a bicolon, occurs widely in the ancient Semitic world, in Sumerian, Hittite and other Semitic texts⁵⁸. One of the two numbers may be intended, whilst the other is supplied as a poetical word-pair⁵⁹; Roth argues that the second number of a bicolon is taken always as literal⁶⁰; Haran supposes that either of the two numbers may be important; possibly seven is the typological number. Wyatt follows this view, interpreting the seven as the ‘dominant’ number; with the second numeral as ballast⁶¹:

y[^c]n i[l] b šb^ct ħ[d]rm E[l] an[swe]red from the seven
c[ham]bers,
[b t]mn[t ap] sgrt [from the e]igh[t entrances of] the *closed*
rooms

(KTU 1.3 v 10-12; 26-27)⁶².

⁵⁶ G.R. Driver (1956: 107); Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 247); Gibson (1978: 71); del Olmo (1981: 219); M.S. Smith (1997: 146 n. 167; 173), though reluctantly; and Wyatt (2002: 122).

⁵⁷ Yet, there is not enough space for the letter ‘m’.

⁵⁸ It occurs also in the Hebrew Bible: Amos 1.3, 6, 9, etc. Cf. Haran (1972: 242); Wyatt (1987b; 2002: 85 n. 64, 122 n. 37).

⁵⁹ Wyatt (1987b: 392; 2002: 85 n. 64) says that it is inserted for “climactic effect”.

⁶⁰ Roth (1962: 304).

⁶¹ Wyatt (1987b: 393).

⁶² The numeral sequence of ‘seven ... eight’ is found in various Ugaritic passages: KTU 1.12 ii 44-49; 1.14 i 6-9; 1.15 ii 23-24; 1.19 i 42-44; 1.23.66-67; and 1.101.3-4, etc.

At this place, the 'seven' is important as the metaphorical number of the septuple celestial structure⁶³. The cosmic centrality of El is portrayed in poetic fashion; El dwells in the 'centre' of the septuple universe, his temple⁶⁴.

As described hitherto, the first number 'seven' in the numeral formula, as attested in the Ugaritic texts, is significant as a 'dominant' number of the bicolon. This may be the same in interpreting the number of the Lads of Baal. Thus, 'seven' may be dominant here. Boars have their number as eight as a poetical word-pair. Yet, their original number was probably seven, which may be identified with the number of Lads⁶⁵.

Day seeks the motif of the number seven, like Yahweh's sevenfold voices in Ps 29, from baalistic origin⁶⁶; hence, the numerical sequence in KTU 1.5 v 8-9 is referred to as a baalistic element⁶⁷. However, the 'sevenfold numeral element' of Lads is better seen as the general symbolic application of cosmology⁶⁸, which may have influenced Semitic thought.

Wyatt has proposed that the characteristics of the Boars of Baal may be related to a cognate tradition of the Maruts, assistants of Indra, an Indian god⁶⁹; hence, he has recognised it as evidence of eastern influence into the west, mediated through the Hurrians⁷⁰. Yet his view has been changed later,

⁶³ The sevenfold structure is found in a number of Egyptian temples, such as the Edfu temple of Horus. For an explanation of its sevenfold architectural structure, see Wyatt (1996: 46 n. 58).

⁶⁴ The menorah of the Jerusalem temple is an "architectural equivalent to the metaphor of the seven lights of heaven": Wyatt (1987b: 392).

⁶⁵ Wyatt (1987b: 395).

⁶⁶ J. Day (1985: 59).

⁶⁷ J. Day (1985: 34).

⁶⁸ Wyatt (1987b: 395 n. 21) argues that it is found even in Vedic tradition.

⁶⁹ Wyatt (1987b: 397; 2002: 122 n. 37); ANET 206: the DN 'Indra' appears as a divine witness in a Hurro-Hittite treaty text.

⁷⁰ Wyatt (2002: 122 n. 37). He (Wyatt, 1988: 384) remarked that the Hurrians evidently brought numerous Indo-European elements into the west. The Indo-European elements came, probably, in the early-mid second millennium, B.C.E.; see Thieme (1960: 301-317). Wyatt (*ibid.*: 377) suggested the connection between Baal's *hnrzm*, 'Boars', and the myth

tracking the origin of the *Chaoskampf* myth, to sustain the theory that Ug. *ḥnẓr* is probably an 'animal term for military rank'⁷¹.

Therefore, Ug. *ḥnẓr* can be regarded as a polysemous term to convey two meanings at a time⁷². It signifies 'boar' together with the sense of military 'officer', which is applied as one of the attributes of the lesser deities of Baal, although depictions of the *ḥnẓr* participating in the divine warfare are still missing from Ugaritic texts.

1.6. *mhr* 'Warriors'

Ug. *mhr*⁷³ is used to indicate either human⁷⁴ or divine warriors⁷⁵. Thus, in the mythic contexts, the usage of the term applied to the assistant deities of Baal or Anat is found:

of *Varāha*, which means 'boar'; *Varāha* may be identified with *Prajāpati*, who has later developed into *Brahmā*, the creator. The boar and the horse are both common as sacrificial animals in the Indian context (*ibid.*: 379). Wyatt (*ibid.*: 376) interestingly suggested that these two figures in Ugaritic myth, which are present in Baal's martial epithet *rkb ʿrpt*, 'Charioteer of Clouds' (KTU 1.2 iv 29 and 1.3 iii 38, etc.) and his *ḥnẓrm*, 'Boars', may have been transported from proto-Aryan tradition as a possible Indo-European connection. See Wyatt (*ibid.*: 381). Thus, Ug. *ḥnẓr* may combine the two motifs of the sacrificial victim, as appearing in the Indian religious tradition, and of the military officer. However, Wyatt (1998a; also 2002: 122 n. 37) has modified this view later.

⁷¹ Wyatt (2002: 122 n. 37).

⁷² Wyatt (2002: 122 n. 37).

⁷³ Ug. *mhr*, regarded as a polyglot vocabulary (Margalit, 1976: 183 n. 131), denotes 'warrior (trained, expert), soldier, combatant, hero; warrior strength; or dowry, price, bride price': DUL 536-7 (I); (II); (III). For the etymological references for its meaning as 'warrior', cf. Heb. מַהֲרִי, מַהֲרִי: HALOT 552, 553-4; Aram. *mhyr*: DNWSI 602; and Ar. *māhir*: AEL 2740.

⁷⁴ For the cases of human soldiers: KTU 1.17 vi 40; perhaps, 1.3 ii 11, 15, 21, 28, 35 (indicating Anat's enemies); and 1.10 i 11.

⁷⁵ KTU 1.13.7 (indicating Anat's assistant warriors); 1.22 i 8-9; 1.22 ii 7; probably, 1.18 iv 6, [11], 27; 1.19 iv [52], and [56] (sc. Yatipan), etc. At 1.18 iv 26, Cunchillos and Vita (1995: 1284) correct *mprh* to *mhrh*; also, Pardee (1997: 350 n. 75), indicating Aqhat, in this case. Margalit (1989a: 156, 212 and n. 54), R.M. Wright (1994: 539-41), and Wyatt (2002: 286) take it as *mprh*. For the reading in KTU 1.18 iv 38, KTU² suggests *mhrh* as *mprh*; thus, see Wyatt (2002: 287 n. 161).

mhr bʿl [*mhr*] ʿnt Warriors⁷⁶ of Baal[
warriors] of Anat⁷⁷

(KTU 1.22 ii 7-8).

The divine epithets (*mhr bʿl w mhr ʿnt*) occur again in KTU 1.22 i 8-9:

tm tmq rpu bʿl There (were) Thamaq⁷⁸, Rapiʿu⁷⁹ of Baal,
mhr bʿl w mhr ʿnt warriors⁸⁰ of Baal and warriors of Anat.

The texts contain the invocation of the warrior deities in the ritual ceremony with the *rpu(m)*, 'Rapiʿuma', the deceased and deified kings⁸¹. Whilst the *mhr bʿl* may be referred to as *šbʿt ḡlmk tmn ḥnzrk*, 'seven Lads, eight Boars'⁸², the identity of *mhr ʿnt* is not clearly laid out in the texts⁸³. However, it may be inferred from the context of the texts:

bšr kp Sever⁸⁴ (their) hands⁸⁵;

⁷⁶ Ug. *mhr* may be used here as a pl. construct noun. Differently, Wyatt (2002: 319 and n. 28) takes it here as a sg. construct form, in regard to the context of KTU 1.22 i 8-9, where it is argued as an occurrence employed as a sg.

⁷⁷ Cf. Ug. *mhrk*, 'your warriors', at KTU 1.13.7, which denotes assistant deities of Anat.

⁷⁸ Thamaq may be read as a PN as most commentators refer: Aistleitner (1964: 85); Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 475 n. u); del Olmo (1981: 423); Wyatt (2002: 321 n. 38). Cf. *bn tmq* at KTU 4.93 iv 3.

⁷⁹ Further discussion of the *rpu(m)* shall be made below.

⁸⁰ Ug. *mhr* may be used here as a pl. construct noun. Differently, Wyatt (2002: 319 and n. 28) takes it here as a sg. construct form, in regard to the context of KTU 1.22 i 8-9, where it is argued as an occurrence employed as a sg.

⁸¹ The texts of KTU 1.20-22 are identified as part of the Aqhat story (KTU 1.17-19); cf. de Moor (1987: 266-73).

⁸² A cylinder seal excavated from Ras Shamra presents a picture of the divine quarrel of Baal with the mythological serpent Litan. See Porada (1948: pl. CI, 688e). In this scene, there appear two divine figures behind Baal who help him by bringing divine weapons. They seem to be his divine warriors or auxiliaries.

⁸³ Two designations, *mhr bʿl* and *mhr ʿnt*, are joined by the conjunction *w* in KTU 1.22 i 8-9. It may indicate the fact that they are each of two different groups of assistant deities who belong to Baal and Anat respectively.

⁸⁴ Ug. *bšr*, to 'sever': DUL 242 (II). Cf. Heb. *בצר*: HALOT 148; Akk. *bašāru*: AHw 110; CAD 2[B] 134.

šsk [xx]x l ḥbšk

make (their) [blood]⁸⁶ run⁸⁷ to your
girdle⁸⁸;

ʿtk riš[t] l mhrk

tie⁸⁹ (their) heads to⁹⁰ your warriors

(KTU 1.13 R 5-7).

Lloyd interprets Ug. *mhrk* at line 7 as Anat's 'warriors', whom she has slain (sc. her 'enemies')⁹¹. Against this observation, Wyatt argues that Ug. *mhrk* in lines 7 and 14⁹² represents "soldiers in the goddess's service (sc. warriors),

⁸⁵ Ug. *kp*, 'palm (of the hand)': DUL 452. Cf. Heb. כַּף: HALOT 491-2; Aram. *kp*: DNWSI 528; Syr. *kappō*: Brockelmann (1966: 339); Akk. *kappu*: AHw 444; CAD 8[K] 185-8; Arab. *kaff*: AEL 658; and Eth. *kaf*: Leslau (1987: 276). It probably denotes 'hand' here: Walls (1992: 140); Wyatt (2002: 169).

⁸⁶ The text may be restored as [*dm*]; cf. de Moor (1980b: 305); del Olmo (1981: 492); and Lloyd (1994: 274).

⁸⁷ Ug. *šsk* may be construed as a Š form of the √*nsk*, to 'pour (out), spill': Cazelles (1956: 51); de Moor (1980b: 305; 1987: 138); Lloyd (1994: 274); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 644); thus, to 'make run, flow'. Cf. Heb. שָׁךְ: HALOT 703; Ph., Pun. Aram. *nsk*: DNWSI 735-6; Akk. *nasāku*: AHw 752; CAD 11/2[N] 15-20. Differently, les paumes de 'ceux qui te pillent': Caquot (1989: 22 and n. 10); hands of 'your binding': Walls (1992: 140); 'attach': Wyatt (2002: 170 and n. 5).

⁸⁸ De Moor (1971: 91-2) relates Ug. *ḥbšk* to Heb. חֲשֵׁב, 'girdle': HALOT 360; and Akk. *abšu*: AHw 7; CAD 1/1[A] 66. Cf. Walls (1992: 140); Wyatt (2002: 170). Differently, 'carnier': Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 159 n. o); 'jar': Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 184); 'governor': Gibson (1978: 146); Caquot (1989: 22 and n. 11); 'cinch, belt, waist': del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 353-4, [I]), referring to Heb. שֵׁבַח: HALOT 289; or, 'arm': Dietrich-Loretz (1972: 30). The warrior may be in bloodstained clothes after slaying his or her enemies. Cf. Baal is also in a bloody garment (KTU 1.12 ii 45-7).

⁸⁹ The impv. form of the √*ʿtk*, to 'tie, fasten, bind': DUL 191. Cf. Ar. *ʿataka*: AEL 1948.

⁹⁰ Ug. *l* is taken here as a preposition, before the *ḥbšk*, which indicates a direction, like the *l* as at *l ḥbšk* in the previous line: UT §19.1337; DUL 475-82. Wyatt (2002: 170 and n. 7) notes that Ug. *l* is translated here as 'of' or 'from'.

⁹¹ Lloyd (1994: 274). In KTU 1.3 ii, Anat's transcendent valour as the war-goddess is juxtaposed with the bloody defeat of soldiers (*dmr*) or warriors (*mhrm*) in the descriptions (KTU 1.3 ii 13-5, 27-8, and 34-5; cf. other military designations appear in lines 21-2: '*mhr*' ('warriors'), ... *šbim* ('armies'), ... *gžrm* ('heroes'). They are the ones whom Anat has fought and slain at war, and who refer, perhaps, to human rather than divine beings.

⁹² KTU² reads the text as *tm tpl ... [x(x)]rxm*, 'There (your) [warriors] shall fall ...', and comments (n. 2) that 'the sign between r and m is an illegible emendation', whilst it is

not just *enemy soldiers*⁹³. Meanwhile, he suggests that Ug. *bmtk*, ‘your back’, is a better reading than Ug. *mhrk*, ‘your warriors’, in line 7, as it is found in KTU 1.3 ii 11-3:

ʿtk rišt l bmtk She (Anat) tied heads to her back;
šnst kpt b ḥbšh she girded⁹⁴ hands on her girdle.

Thus he supposes the text of KTU 1.13.7 as *ʿtk rišt l bmtk*, ‘tie heads to your back’⁹⁵.

However, there seems to be no difficulty to take Ug. *mhrk* in line 7 in itself, as all major readings (KTU¹⁺², CTA) support it. Furthermore, it does not make any semantic trouble when it is construed as the ‘warrior deities of Anat’ herself, which may be related to the *mhr ʿnt*, ‘warriors of Anat’, in KTU 1.22 i 9; 1.22 ii 7-8. Since the content of the KTU 1.13 describes a hymn to Anat⁹⁶, therefore Ug. *mhrk* may indicate Anat’s own assistant deities who are implied to accompany her in the divine war. Thus, through the divine epithet *mhr bʿl/mhr ʿnt*, it may be surmised that Baal and Anat have collaborated in the battles to fight Baal’s enemies (cf. KTU 1.10 ii 24-5) with their combined forces of the divine warriors⁹⁷.

referred to as *ʿrīm* (KTU¹) or as *ʿrgm* (CTA). Cf. Wyatt (2002: 171 n. 19) also takes a reading after *r* on *rxm* as an erased sign and restores it as *mhrm*, as at line 7.

⁹³ Wyatt (2002: 73 n. 17).

⁹⁴ The G. 3. f. sg. form of the $\sqrt{\text{šns}}$, to ‘gird (oneself)’: DUL 833. Cf. Heb. סָבַח : HALOT 1607.

⁹⁵ Wyatt (2002: 170 n. 8).

⁹⁶ Cf. Wyatt (2002: 169).

⁹⁷ Kapelrud (1952: 107). Kapelrud (*ibid.*: 109 n. 4) also comments that “Baal was accompanied by Anat, *ʿnt* III: 33 ff, and probably also by his soldiers, 124:9; 123:7 f.” and adds that “It is most likely, then, also the sea monster had its army”. Cf. the names of divine warriors, in KTU 1.3 iii 38-46, who may have allied with the sea god.

1.7. *mḥš* 'Beaters'

When Baal and Anat come to Athirat, they are called *mḥš*, 'beaters, fighters, or destroyers'⁹⁸ by Athirat (KTU 1.4 ii 24). It is suggested that Athirat's speech in the episode alludes to the event in which her sons were slain by Baal (cf. KTU 1.12 ii 45-49)⁹⁹.

Nevertheless, if the *ib* is construed in the Ugaritic texts, as discussed above, as a warrior group including associated deities for the divine conflict, then the *mḥš* here may be rendered also to have the same connotation; thus, Baal, Anat, and their assistant warriors, coming to attack the sons of Athirat, can be called the *mḥš* altogether, as a collective noun.

1.8. *Rapi'uma*¹⁰⁰

The *rpum* are one of the enigmatic entities in the Ugaritic texts¹⁰¹. Their characteristics fall largely into two distinctions: warrior deities or divinised dead kings.

Some have claimed that they are minor gods who serve the higher gods¹⁰². Hence, they have been regarded as warrior deities for them¹⁰³. Thus,

⁹⁸ Ug. *mḥš*, 'one who beats, weaver, beater, an evil being': DUL 541-2. Akk. *māḥiṣu*: AHw 584; CAD 10/1[M] 102.

⁹⁹ Margalit (1980: 31). He refers the background of this episode to the Hittite Elkunirša myth.

¹⁰⁰ Ug. *rpum* is rendered as an active ptc. form, derived from the \sqrt{rp} , to 'heal', vocalising into *rāpi'ūma*: Rouillard (1999: 692). Its translation is suggested variously: 'Götterfürsten' (Aistleitner, 1964: 83); 'mânes': Caquot-Szzyner (1974: 477); 'hale ones': L'Heureux (1979: 130); 'saviours' (de Moor, 1987: 266; followed by Wyatt, 2002: 315, and cf. n. 1: they have a 'soteriological function in maintaining society'); or 'shades': Lewis (1996: 118). We leave the *rpum* untranslated, like del Olmo (1981: 417).

¹⁰¹ They appear significantly in KTU 1.20-22, 1.108, 1.161, and elsewhere. These three fragments of KTU 1.20-22 are the so called "RPUM texts", which are regarded as part of the *Aqhat* story (KTU 1.17-19); cf. de Moor (1987: 266 ff.).

¹⁰² Virolleaud (1940: 77-83); Dussaud (1941: 185-8).

¹⁰³ Ryan (1954: 84 ff., and esp. 94) suggested them as chariot warriors of Shapsh as well as of Baal (referred to in *rpum b'ḥ* at KTU 1.22 i 8; thus, they are ruled also by Shapsh

Ug. *rp*² was suggested as a 'divine epithet with a general meaning appropriate to a number of different gods'¹⁰⁴. Margulis has referred to them as a 'band of divine or semi-divine (*ilnym*) chariot-warriors'¹⁰⁵; articulately, 'chthonic beings (*ilnym*), the shades of the warrior-aristocracy called *rpi arš/qbš dtn*' (or *ddn*); thus, they may have been identified as the 'living warriors (*gžrm*) designated "Raphaite-men" (*mt rpi*)', and also as the 'dead forebears' (*rpi qdmym* at KTU 1.161)¹⁰⁶. Ginsberg translated *rpi arš*¹⁰⁷ as the 'community of the land'¹⁰⁸. Gaster rendered Ug. *rpi* into 'members of the assembly', believing that it is related to the '*rpum* who are described elsewhere in Ugaritic literature as the members of the entourage of Baal'¹⁰⁹. Ug. *rpu* has been regarded, less convincingly, also as an epithet of El¹¹⁰; hence L'Heureux construed the relationship of the supreme god *rpu* and the *rpum* as that of El and the other gods (*ilm* or *bn il[m]*), which corresponds to the biblical relationship of Yahweh and his lesser gods (הקדשים and הקדש)¹¹¹; thus, it was argued that the *rpum* are 'all the gods in El's entourage'¹¹².

(KTU 1.6 vi 46 ff.); cf. Jirku (1965: 80-3). Gordon (1977: 30-2) viewed them as warriors of Baal and Anat. L'Heureux (1979: 229), accepting Ryan's suggestion, said that they are on a "subordinate level of deities who form the charioteering escort of Baal and Shapsh respectively" on the basis of KTU 1.22 i 8 and KTU 1.6 vi 45-7.

¹⁰⁴ L'Heureux (1976: 84).

¹⁰⁵ Following Jirku (1965: 82-3); Margulis (1970b: 300-1) also took them as the *mhr*, 'warrior'.

¹⁰⁶ Margalit (1976: 182 n. 129).

¹⁰⁷ '*rpi arš* || *qbš dtn*': KTU 1.15 iii 3-4; 14-15; 1.161.2-3, and 9-10. Whilst *KTU*² takes *rp[a]* for a reading at KTU 1.161.4 and 5, Cunchillos and Vita (1995: 1832) restore it as *rp[i arš]*.

¹⁰⁸ Ginsberg (1946: 23, and cf. 41).

¹⁰⁹ Gaster (1947a: 289).

¹¹⁰ Virolleaud (1968: 551-7); also, Avishur (1994: 280-1); thus, El is called *rpu mlk 'lm*, 'Rapiu ('Healer') King of Eternity', as at KTU 1.108.19-20 (cf. 21-22). Otherwise, the identity of the *rpu* in KTU 1.108 has been interpreted as an independent deity (Parker, 1970: 243-4) or as Baal (Dietrich-Loretz, 1980: 179).

¹¹¹ L'Heureux (1974: 268-9; 1979: 229). They correspond to the Rephaim in the Hebrew Bible; cf. Wyatt (2006).

¹¹² L'Heureux (1976: 84).

On the other hand, it has been posited that the *rpum* are King Keret and his officials¹¹³. However, they are recognised, more probably, as dead and divinised kings¹¹⁴. They occur as paralleled with other titles, Ug. *ilnym*, 'divine ones'¹¹⁵ and Ug. *mtm(tm)*, 'the dead'¹¹⁶. In the so-called *rpum* text (KTU 1.20-22), the *rpum* comprises the assembled¹¹⁷ *sd*¹¹⁸, the divine 'council' in the ritual context. It is there that they hold a seven day long banquet (KTU 1.22 i 21-5), after having travelled for three days (KTU 1.20 ii 5; 1.22 ii 24-5)¹¹⁹.

¹¹³ Gray (1948-9: 127-9). He (Gray, 1952) later argued that the *rpum* indicate the original inhabitants in ancient Ugarit, identified as kings of yore. Heltzer (1978: esp., 15) insisted that the *rpum* are clan members, corresponding to the *rabba'um* in Mari, since Keret is exalted as one of them.

¹¹⁴ Rouillard (1999: 692-5); Wyatt (2006).

¹¹⁵ The pl. form of the *ilny*, 'divine one', adj. derived from *iln*, 'deity, god': DUL 60. It occurs in KTU 1.1 iii [19] (= 1.3 iv 35); 1.2 iii [3]; 1.6 vi 47; 1.20 i 2; 1.20 ii 2, [6]; 1.20 ii 2, [6], [9]; 1.21 ii 4, [12]; 1.22 ii [4], [6], [9], [11], [19], [21], and [26]. Wyatt (2002: 45 and n. 35) interprets that the *ilnym* are 'chthonian gods'. In KTU 1.6 vi 45-7, Ug. *rpum* (*rpim*) occur in parallelism with Ug. *ilnym*; they are both said to be subordinate to Shapsh: *špš rpim tḥtk špš tḥtk ilnym*, 'Shapsh, you rule the Rapi'uma; Shapsh, you rule the divine ones'. For further discussion on the text, cf. Wyatt (2002: 144 nn. 120, 121). In the following lines (48-9), they are identified as the *ilm* and *mtm*: *ʿdk ilm hn mtm ʿdk*, 'Your assembly are the gods; lo, mortals are your assembly'.

¹¹⁶ Cf. KTU 1.6 vi 48; 1.10 i 10; 1.20 i 3; and 1.22 i 6. At KTU 1.20 i 3, the text has been read variously: *k mʿamtm* (CTA); *w/k mtmtm* (KTU¹⁺²); *k mtmtm* (CARTU). Thus it has been interpreted as 'dead persons': *k mt mtm*, 'when men are dead' (Caquot-Szyncer, 1974: 477 and n. a; Dijkstra-de Moor, 1975: esp., 214); 'shades of the dead' (Gordon, 1977: 9); Pope (1977: 163); *km tmtm*, 'so that when you (pl.) die' (del Olmo, 1981: 417). Wyatt (2002: 315 n. 4) construes it as a construct phrase: *mt mtm*, 'dead men', arguing that 'Whatever the precise nuance, *ilnym* and *mtmtm* refer to the *rpum*'. They are suggested as 'dead and deified heroes/kings': del Olmo (1981: 412-3 and 417); de Moor (1987: 266 n. 266); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 60).

¹¹⁷ Cf. KTU 1.20 ii 1-12.

¹¹⁸ This Ugaritic term occurs as a hapax legomenon at KTU 1.20 i 4.

¹¹⁹ They are invited perhaps by Danel to his palace (del Olmo, 1981: 405-424), although his invitations are construed to be devised by different speakers (van der Toorn (1991: 54); Wyatt (2002: 317 n. 22).

Furthermore, King Keret is blessed by El (KTU 1.15 ii 17-20) and his lesser gods (KTU 1.15 iii 17-19) to become like one of them (Ug. *rpi*)¹²⁰. Thus, they may be better understood as divinised dead kings¹²¹. In any event, the view taken that the *rpum* equates with warriors may also apply to ancient Ugaritic kings.

Summary

The various divine titles (*il t^cdr*, *ʿnn*, *glm*, *hnr*, and *mhr*, etc.) occurring in the Ugaritic texts confirm the role of lesser deities as divine warriors. The Ugaritic texts suggest that the lesser deities have significantly participated in the divine conflict between the higher gods (KTU 1.5 v 6-9; 1.5 iv 8-9, etc.).

2. Named Warrior Deities in the Ugaritic Texts

Among other anonymous warrior deities, some warrior deities appear with their own names. Thus the research will discuss the named warrior deities in the Ugaritic texts: Qadesh-and-Amurr and Yatipan. Accordingly some relevant texts will be analysed.

¹²⁰ KTU 1.15 iii 2-4 and || 13-5: *b tk rpi ar[s] b pḥr qbš dtn*, 'among the *rpum* of the earth, in the assembly of the clan of Ditan'. Caquot's suggestion (1985: 353), followed by Rouillard (1999: 693), that the divine blessing is subsequent to the death of Keret is not plausible in the context. Rather, it may be written in a hyperbolic, even ironic, style to exalt Keret for the text tells the fact that he may be dead, as well as other already dead kings: Wyatt (2002: 210 n. 152). Cf. he is called also *bn(m) il*, the 'son of El' (KTU 1.16 i 10, 20; and 1.16 ii 48).

¹²¹ Wyatt (2002: 315 n. 1) interprets that the *rpum* occur as 'apparently divinized dead kings' in KTU 1.20-22. Cf. L'Heureux (1979: 130-1) refuses this idea that the *rpum* are the dead.

2.1. Qadesh-and-Amurr as a Single Deity

The messenger deity named as *qdš w amrr*, 'Qadesh-and-Amurr'¹²², who is the divine lad of Athirat¹²³, appears as a warrior in the Ugaritic texts¹²⁴.

Regarding the issue of their identity, it has been argued that *qdš w amrr* represents two names for a pair of messengers for it is seen as two separate gods in KTU 1.3 vi 11; 1.4 iv 2-3, 8, 13, 16-7; and also 1.4 ii 29¹²⁵. However, unlike the case of Gupan and Ugar, *qdš w amrr* rather seems to be a single deity in those cases – it is common in the Ugaritic texts to split a double-barrelled DN into two separate phrases, as in the instance of Kothar-and-Hasis in KTU 1.17 v 10-11:

<i>hlk ktr k yʿn</i>	the coming of Kothar indeed he saw ¹²⁶ ;
<i>w yʿn tdrq ḥss</i>	and saw the march ¹²⁷ of Hasis.

Thus, *qdš w amrr* is regarded as a binomial name¹²⁸ to indicate the elevated characteristics of the same entity.

¹²² The etymological root of Ug. *amrr* is regarded as *mrr*, to 'strengthen, bless'; thus, Virolleaud (1932: 135); Gordon (1965: §19.233, cf. §19.1556); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 73); as an 'elative ʿ*qll* pattern'. Cf. Mullen (1980: 214 n. 172): 'most blessed', in order to 'make an excellent parallel' to the first element of the name of the messenger, *qdš*, the 'Holy One'. Differently, as a variant form of ʿ*amr*: Aistleitner (1974: no. 289); as the double spelling of *r*; thus, the long consonant (*rr*): Dietrich-Loretz (1973: 74).

¹²³ KTU 1.4 iv 13, etc. However, KTU 1.3 vi describes that Baal instructs Qadesh-and-Amurr, the messenger of Athirat. Thus, it may be suggested that he functions as the intermediary messenger between the higher deities.

¹²⁴ KTU 1.3 vi 11; 1.4 iv 2-3, 8, 13, 16, and 17. It occurs also in a ritual text (KTU 1.123.26).

¹²⁵ Mullen (1980: 214 n. 172); del Olmo (1981: 196); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 697): *qdš* (III).

¹²⁶ Ug. ʿ*n*, to 'see, look (at), watch, spy': DUL 167-8. Cf. Heb. ִעַן: HALOT 817; Ph. ʿ*yn*: DNWSI 840-1; Ar. ʿ*ayyana*, ʿ*āyana*: AEL 2214.

¹²⁷ Ug. *tdrq*, 'nimble step, march': DUL 860; 'approach': Wyatt (2002: 268). Cf. 'tread, gait': Gordon (1965: §19.708), relating to Ar. *daraqa*, to 'walk hastily'; Huehnergard (1987: 119-120), referring to Akk. *daraggu*, 'path': AHW 163; CAD 3[D] 108.

¹²⁸ Pope (1965c: 304).

2.2. The 'Warrior' Role of Qadesh-and-Amurr

In KTU 1.3 vi, Qadesh-and-Amurr is commanded by Baal to bring his message to Kothar-and-Hasis. In this regard, we may deduce that divine messengers serve other higher gods as well as their master god¹²⁹. He takes a 'warrior' role as well as a 'messenger' role. In the Ugaritic text the marine epithet of Qadesh-and-Amurr emerges:

šmšr l dgy atrt Drive¹³⁰, O Fisherman¹³¹ of Athirat;
mġ l qdš amrr go, O Qadesh-(and)-Amurr!

(KTU 1.3 vi 9-11).

Del Olmo and Sanmartín suggest that the object of the verb *šmšr* may be inferred as a 'chariot'¹³². If the verb conveys that military nuance, Qadesh-(and)-Amurr may be observed as a warrior deity.

The messenger has his own epithet: *dgy* of DN. Here the term *dgy* occurs probably as a singular form, which may indicate that this figure is a single god. Although it may be seen also as a pl. construct form, the position as a single deity is preferred here. If dual messengers were intended at this place, the insertion of *w* between *qdš* and *amrr* would be required for two separate deities to make more sense in the following line. Hence, two attributions may be combined in one DN in order to express two characteristics of one deity; thus, the two divine names characterise the deity with utmost clarity.

¹²⁹ Cf. de Moor (1971: 129).

¹³⁰ A Š form of the Ug. $\sqrt{mšr}$, to 'set a vehicle in motion, drive': DUL 593. Cf. Akk. *mašāru*: AHW 624; CAD 10/1[M] 359-60. Cf. 'set off': Wyatt (2002: 89). Differently, 'apresurarse, dispararse': del Olmo (1981: 585). Sanmartín (1978: 352-3) reads *šmm šmšr*; hence, 'schleifen', taking *šmm* as an objection of the verb.

¹³¹ UT §19.642; cf. DUL 268: 'name of a fish-shaped being: triton'; in Greek mythology Triton is a god of the sea, and also son of Poseidon and Amphitrite, portrayed as having the head and trunk of a man and the tail of a fish.

¹³² Del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 593).

Ug. *dgy* also implies a military sense. Eissfeldt compares Ug. *dgy* with BH דג, 'fisherman', (as Qere in Jer 16.16)¹³³ and Gk. 'Ἀλιεύς'¹³⁴. Gordon suggests that Ug. *dgy* is related to the OB term *bā'irum*, 'fisherman'¹³⁵, which is used as a military title¹³⁶.

B. Landsberger divides the military titles used in the late OB period into five hierarchical levels¹³⁷; some of them appear in the Code of Hammurapi; Akk. *bā'irum* is used as a military title in the phrase, paralleled with *rēdûm*, 'soldier'¹³⁸. Gordon is followed by Jirku¹³⁹ and Yamashita¹⁴⁰. The idea of Ug. *dgy* as the military title is evident also in another text:

šmḥ rbt aṭ[rt] ym Great Lady¹⁴¹ Athirat of Sea¹⁴² rejoiced.
gm l ḡlmh k [tṣḥ] Aloud to her Lad [she shouted]:

¹³³ Eissfeldt (1952: 59 n. 1). In Jer 16.16, Yahweh sends fishers and hunters to catch enemies in military campaigns. Yet, the דג in Isa 19.8 that he (Eissfeldt, *ibid.*) mentioned is not connected to military titles, as Yamashita (1975: 48) observed.

¹³⁴ Eissfeldt (1952: 59). Cf. Matt 4.19; Mark 1.17: 'fishers of men'. Jirku (1966: 77-8) refers it to the epithet of the Babylonian god Dumuzi, 'fisher of Kuara'.

¹³⁵ AHw 96: 'Fischer' or 'Netzkämpfer'; CAD 2[B] 31-3: 'fisherman, hunter'.

¹³⁶ UT §19.642.

¹³⁷ B. Landsberger (1955: 122); thus, from the highest rank to the lowest, Akk. UGULA.MAR.TU, 'general'; Akk. PA.PA, 'captain'; Akk. *laputtûm*, 'sergeant'; Akk. *rēdûm*, 'private'; and Akk. *taḥḫum*, 'substitute soldier'.

¹³⁸ CAD 14[R] 246-51. Especially, see Law 26 ix 66 - x 12; and, cf. B. Landsberger (1955: 123).

¹³⁹ Jirku (1966: 77-8) confirms the fact that Ug. *dgy* has a mythological sense, connected with military titles or campaigns.

¹⁴⁰ Yamashita (1975: 48) remarks that 'Ug. *dgy* is also a soldier who runs errands for his commander'.

¹⁴¹ Ug. *rbt*, a f. form of Ug. *bt*, 'great, large' (DUL 727-8 [I]); thus, 'Lady, (great) Lady': DUL 731-2 (I).

¹⁴² The phrase *rbt aṭrt ym*, occurred in KTU 1.3 iv [49], 1.3 v 40-41, and parallels, has been translated usually as a divine epithet; thus, the 'dame Athirat of the Sea': Gibson (1978: 52); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 731-2). Yet, this idea has been denied by a view that Ug. *aṭrt* may be a verb for a word-play; thus, Watson (1993): 'She who organizes the day', rather than as 'sea'; and, cf. Wyatt (2002: 95; and cf. 83 n. 61): the 'Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam'. It is preferably taken here as a DN.

<i>ʿn mktr apq[ym]</i>	‘Look, Expert ¹⁴³ of Channel [of Sea] ¹⁴⁴ !
<i>dgy rbt atr[t ym]</i>	Fisherman of Great Lady Athirat of Sea!
<i>qh rtt bdk t/q[]</i>	Take a net ¹⁴⁵ in your hands []
<i>rbt ʿl ydm[]</i>	(Take) a trawl ¹⁴⁶ in both hands []

(KTU 1.4 ii 28-33).

Unfortunately, it is difficult to know what exactly comes after this because the text is damaged. Nevertheless, it is clear that Ug. *mktr* in line 30 and *dgy* in line 31 are paralleled as epithets of Qadesh-and-Amurr. They are both related to the sea.

In the description, the divine Lad (*glm*) of the goddess Athirat seems to be ready to catch his enemies. And as a warrior he probably needs his own divine tool in order to seize them: *rtt* and *rbt*.

2.3. Yatipan

The name of another distinguished warrior appears as *ytpn*, ‘Yatipan’. As described in the Aqhat tale of KTU 1.18 iv and again in 1.19 iv, the two terms *mhr št*, which form the epithet of Yatipan, identify his role¹⁴⁷. The epithet has

¹⁴³ Ug. *mktr*, a noun form of adj. *ktr*, ‘skilful’ (DUL 471-2 [II]); thus, ‘expert’: DUL 545. Differently, ‘cunning workers’: G.R. Driver (1956: 93); ‘chef d’oeuvre’: Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 199 and n. n); similarly, ‘craftmanship’: Gibson (1978: 57); ‘bondman’: van Selms (1979: 739-744, esp. 743); ‘successful explorer’: de Moor (1987: 48); or, ‘exploit well’: de Moor-Spronk (1987: 147). For the divine epithet of Qadesh-and-Amurr, see Margalit (1980: 26): ‘(he of) the spring which nurtures dry land’.

¹⁴⁴ Whilst CTA and KTU¹ read *ap t[]*, CARTU and KTU² take it as *apq[ym]*, suggesting *ym* after the restored term. Ug. *apq*, ‘spring, source; (preferable to ‘channel, conduit’); stream’: Pope (1955: 72-80, also, cf. 92-104); Schoors (1972: 10-1); Clifford (1972: 49-50); Renfroe (1992: 82); and del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 91). Cf. Heb. פַּיִם: HALOT 78; and Job 6.15. Differently, ‘bottom’ [of the sea]: de Moor (1987: 48); ‘cunning work’: Wyatt (2002: 95).

¹⁴⁵ Ug. *rtt*, ‘net’: DUL 750. Cf. Heb. רֶשֶׁת: HALOT 1298-9.

¹⁴⁶ Ug. *rbt*, ‘seine, trawl’: DUL 732 (II), referring its etymological root to as Ug. *rb*, ‘great, large’.

¹⁴⁷ KTU 1.18 iv 6, 11, 27; 1.19 iv 52-3, and 56-7.

been translated as 'soldier of the Lady'¹⁴⁸. Yet this suggestion is doubted by Margalit for a couple of reasons: the relation of Ug. *št* with the Arabic cognate *sitt* is unconvincing and Ug. *mhr* could be followed by any other DN's (cf. KTU 1.22 ii 7-8: *mhr b'q*; *mhr 'nt*)¹⁴⁹. Instead, it may be read as the 'destructive warrior'¹⁵⁰. It is insisted also that Yatipan is a human¹⁵¹. However, some interpret that he is possibly a lesser deity¹⁵². The story of Yatipan may be better read in the mythological context.

The descriptions of KTU 1.19 iv specifically present the characteristic of Yatipan. He is revealed as a strong warrior; as he drinks wine, he becomes stronger, being served by Pughat who is disguised as Anat (KTU 1.19 iv 53-6)¹⁵³. Then, in the following texts Yatipan speaks:

b yn y št ila With wine¹⁵⁴, O Lady¹⁵⁵, I am strong¹⁵⁶,

¹⁴⁸ Ug. *št*, 'lady'; sc. the goddess Anat: Gordon (1949: 92-3); Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 213). Aistleitner (1974: no. 2704) relates it to Ar. *sitt*; thus, 'Junker der Herrin'; also, Jirku (1962: 127, 128): 'Kämpfer der Dame'.

¹⁴⁹ Further, Margalit (1976: 182) argues that in the RPUM texts, 'there is no additional evidence for *Ytpn* as *mhr 'nt* except for his role as her accomplice'.

¹⁵⁰ Del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 851 [III]): derived from Ar. *šatta*, *šatt*, 'tearing apart, separation, desolation': AEL 1501. Differently, 'buveur', derived from Ug. **šty*: Caquot-Szzyr (1974: 437 n. p.); 'mercenary warrior': Wyatt (2002: 286).

¹⁵¹ Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 213), interpreting Yatipan's claim to be a god himself; accepted by Wyatt (2002: 312 n. 276). Cf. Margalit (1976: 182-3): 'mortal' as the 'nomad'; thus 'Sutean warrior', relating to Akk. *sutu* and Eg. *šwtw*; followed by Dijkstra (1979: 206).

¹⁵² Del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 994): the *mhr št* is the 'title of lesser deity'. Fensham (1966: 159-60) also seems to construe him as a god.

¹⁵³ When the other employed agent, Pughat, appeared to Yatipan, Yatipan called her *št*, 'Lady', the epithet of the goddess Anat because Pughat has disguised herself as Anat. See KTU 1.19 iv 49-52.

¹⁵⁴ Ug. *yn*, 'wine': DUL 968-971. Cf. Heb. יין: HALOT 409-10; Ph., Aram. *ynn*: DNWSI 455-6; Akk. *inu*: AHw 383, 1563.

¹⁵⁵ Ug. *št*, 'lady': UT §19.2500; WUS no. 2704; and Wyatt (2002: 312).

¹⁵⁶ CTA, KTU¹, and CPU (233) suggest a reading as *iln* rather than *ila*; hence, 'our god': Gordon (1949: 101); Gaster (1950: 311; 1961: 375 and n. p); G.R. Driver (1956: 67); Caquot-Szzyr (1974: 457 and n. c); Gibson (1978: 121 and n. 219) or 'our Ilu': del Olmo (1981: 400). Yet the letter would require *ila*, not *iln*, as the tablet reads: thus, KTU². It is better

il šxn []il dyqny ddm (I am) a god of my La[dy]¹⁵⁷, [like¹⁵⁸] a
 god¹⁵⁹, who acquired¹⁶⁰ the tent¹⁶¹!
yd mḥšt a[qh]t ġzr The hand that beat A[qha]t Hero
tmḥš alp̄m ib št will beat a thousand enemies of Lady!

(KTU 1.19 iv 57-59).

Yatipan is portrayed by the verb *ila* in the first line to explain how powerful he is. It has been variously interpreted as an oath by Yatipan¹⁶²; or as the libation of Yatipan¹⁶³; or as a boasting of Yatipan¹⁶⁴. Yatipan seems to be here boasting about himself. Ug. *aliyn*, as noted above, is used to express the powerful characteristic of the higher god. In terms of the same root, Yatipan may be described as comparable with Baal (*ila* vs. *aliyn*). At any rate, he is expressed as being stronger as he drinks. Hence, he may be seen as the most powerful 'warrior' god.

understood as a 1. m. sg. form derived from the \sqrt{liy} , to 'be strong', which is used in the derivatives: *aliyn* (as the epithet of Baal), *alit* (as a DN), *aliy*, 'most powerful' (as an elative form), and *lan*, 'power' (as a noun); cf. Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 213); 'I am scol[d]': de Moor (1987: 264); taking his first observation, 'I am strong': Wyatt (2002: 312 and n. 275). Differently, as a DN, 'ILA': Margalit (1989a: 166, 242); Pardee (1997: 355).

¹⁵⁷ It may be reconstructed as *štn*.

¹⁵⁸ Ug. *k* is suggested in the lacuna between *šxn* and *il*. See Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 213).

¹⁵⁹ Whilst the second Ug. *il* is taken as a DN, El (Dijkstra-de Moor, 1975: 213; de Moor, 1987: 265), it is construed as Yatipan himself: 'the god' (Wyatt, 2002: 312). It is preferably read here as any of the lesser gods who can be compared with Yatipan himself, ranked according to the position, in which they have to serve their master(ess).

¹⁶⁰ Ug. *qny*, to 'acquire, create, procreate' (DUL 706), is better taken with a denotation, to 'acquire'. Cf. 'created': Margalit (1976: 186).

¹⁶¹ Ug. *ḡd*, with an enclitic *-m*, 'tent': Clifford (1972: 51-4, 125), referring to Ar. *ḡāda*, *ḡawd*; Wyatt (2002: 312). Differently, 'encampment': Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 192); Renfroe (1992: 97-100), relating to Ar. *ḡwd*; 'grotto, cave': del Olmo (1984b: 156 ff.); DUL 283 (I). For other various opinions, cf. del Olmo (*ibid.*).

¹⁶² del Olmo (1981: 400).

¹⁶³ Gaster (1961: 375); Margalit (1976: 186); and Gibson (1978: 121 and n. 4).

¹⁶⁴ Wyatt (2002: 312; cf. 278).

In the following lines Yatipan declares the fact that he becomes a lesser god of Anat at the moment ('I am a god of my Lady'), like other lesser gods who have their own shelters: *bnh mtb*, '(there is) a residence (even for) his (sc. El's) sons'¹⁶⁵. As the father of the gods, El provides the abode for his sons (sc. El's lesser gods). Tents may be said to be the belongings of other lesser gods.

He further makes an oath that he will be the divine aegis for Anat. In this regard, Yatipan is viewed as the lesser deity¹⁶⁶ who fights as a 'mercenary'¹⁶⁷ warrior. As her employed warrior, he will destroy other 'enemy' gods or mortals (KTU 1.19 iv 58-9). The quality of his divine power (hand) is now overwhelming the other gods' power that threatens the goddess Anat. In any case, Yatipan appears as '*agent provocateur*' of Anat¹⁶⁸.

Summary

Qadesh-and-Amurr, whose name is binomial, appears as the Athirat's single warrior deity involved in the divine warfare. He also functions as the divine messenger between the higher gods. Yatipan is suggested, possibly, as the warrior deity. His epithet *mhr št*, 'destructive warrior', indicates his characteristic. As the mercenary warrior of Anat, he is employed to fight her enemies.

Conclusion to Chapter IV, Part I

The Ugaritic texts expose that most major gods have their own lesser deities to express their force. Thus, the lesser deities take their role as warriors to help their master gods.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. KTU 1.3 iv [49]; 1.3 v 40; 1.4 i 13; and 1.4 iv 52-53.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Gaster (1961: 354 ff.) understands him as 'henchman'.

¹⁶⁷ Whilst accepting Margalit's (1989a: 337-40) interpretation of *št* as the sociological term 'Sutean', Wyatt (2002: 282 n. 141) construes it as 'mercenary warrior'.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Wyatt's (2002: 283 n. 146) note.

Among these anonymous warrior deities, the lesser deity named Qadesh-and-Amurr performs his mission as a warrior deity as well as a messenger deity. Yatipan appears as one of them and performs as the warrior deity in the mythological context. Thus it is concluded that the higher deities in Ugaritic mythology are associated with their lesser deities in the context of the divine warfare.

The divine assembly of Yahweh is often connected to the motif of the military hosts¹⁶⁹ and various Hebrew terms are applied to the celestial host: מַשְׁחִית, מַמְתִּים, מַלְאֲךְ (יהוה), מַחֲנֶה (אלהים), כּוֹכָבִים, גְּבִרִים, אַבִּירִים, שָׂר, etc. Among them, Michael appears as the named warrior deity. This research will look into the Hebrew terms that denote 'warrior deities' and some Hebrew texts related to the subject.

1. The Hebrew Titles for Warrior Deities

1.1 אַבִּירִים 'Bulls'

Whilst the singular form אַבִּיר is used to indicate the supreme god¹⁷⁰, its plural form אַבִּירִים occurs to signify his lesser deities only at Ps 78.25¹⁷¹:

לַחֵם אַבִּירִים אָכַל אִישׁ Man ate the bread of Bulls¹⁷².

LXX reads the text: ἄρτον ἀγγέλων ἔφαγεν ἄνθρωπος, 'man ate the bread¹⁷³ of angels¹⁷⁴'. The meaning of Heb. אַבִּיר may be rendered as 'strength, power'¹⁷⁵.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. 2 Kgs 6.17; 7.6; Isa 10.13; 13.4-5; Ps 68.18; Joel 4.11; and Hab 3.8.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Gen 49.24; Ps 132.2, 5; Isa 1.24; 49.26; and 60.16. It also occurs denoting a human warrior: 1 Sam 21.8; Job 34.20.

¹⁷¹ As a pl. form, it denotes also humans (Lam 1.15) or strong animals (Judg 5.22).

¹⁷² Or, 'Mighty Ones'. The אַבִּיר, 'mighty, valiant, strong, powerful, buffalo, stallion' (BDB 7; HALOT 6), derived from the אָבַר, to 'be strong, powerful' (HALOT 9). For its cognates, cf. Akk. *ab(ā)ru*: AHw 7; CAD 1/1[A] 38. Ug. *ibr* denotes vigorous animals; thus, 'bull, horse': DUL 10-11 (I).

¹⁷³ Cf. 'manna': Exod 16.4, 14; Num 11.7; and Ps 105.40.

¹⁷⁴ The majority of translations take it as 'angels': NASB; RSV; NIV; and KJV. Hence, Tate (1990: 282).

¹⁷⁵ Its cognates take its substantive denotation, 'force, power': Akk. *ab(ā)ru*; Samal. *ḫbrw* (DNWSI 7). The Ugaritic designation for those forceful animals may be a metaphor analogised from the presupposed substantive meaning of the term: 'strength, power', although its substantive usage for 'power' is not attested in the Ugaritic texts.

Thus it is referred to a 'strong animal'¹⁷⁶. With this sense the term may express the bellicose appearance of the lesser deities; hence, it may become a synonymous term for warrior deities.

The warlike image is here adopted probably to describe their function as warriors, like other Ugaritic animal titles for warriors: *tr*, 'bull'; *zby*, 'gazelle'; or, *hnzr*, 'boar', etc., already discussed above. Thus, they can be called 'Bulls', which may be reminiscent of the 'bull' appearance of El's sons in the Ugaritic texts¹⁷⁷.

1.2. גבורים 'Mighty Ones'

The first occurrence of Heb. גבורים as the designation of divine beings is found in Gen 6.4, where it is used to identify the offspring resulted by the divine-human relationship¹⁷⁸.

The phrase גבורי כח, 'mighty ones of power', occurs as a hapax legomenon in Ps 103.20, where it is paralleled with מלאכים and also with צבא in v. 21¹⁷⁹. The term denotes the superlative power of the lesser deities. Thus it may be translated as 'mighty warriors'¹⁸⁰.

1.3. כוכבים 'Stars'

The cosmic designation of stars may be used metaphorically to express the huge number of divine warriors of Yahweh:

¹⁷⁶ A.A. Anderson (1972: [2] 568): such as steed (Judg 5.22) or bull (Isa 10.13).

¹⁷⁷ Cf. discussion under the category of 'The Outward Appearance of Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts' in Chapter II.

¹⁷⁸ The textual discussion has been conducted already in Chapter II.

¹⁷⁹ Further discussion will be made under the category of 'Psalm 103.19-21' in Chapter V.

¹⁸⁰ NJB. Cf. Dahood (1966-70: [3] 30): 'soldiers'.

מן שמים נלחמו הכוכבים

From the heavens the Stars¹⁸¹

fought;

ממסלותם נלחמו עם סיסרא

From their courses¹⁸² they

fought against Sisera

(Judg 5.20).

In the battle description of the Song of Deborah, the stars have been interpreted as a source of rain, which consequently caused the flooding of Kishon, on the basis of the argument¹⁸³ that they appear also as the source of rain in the Ugaritic text; thus, KTU 1.3 ii 41: [r]bb *nskh kbkbm*, '[driz]zle¹⁸⁴ (with) which Stars poured¹⁸⁵ (on) her (sc. Anat)¹⁸⁶, which is paralleled with *!l šmm*, 'dew of heavens' and *rbb [r]kb ʿrpt*, 'drizzle of the Charioteer of the Clouds'.

However, this idea is untenable if we consider the fact that 'it is also possible that the stars were a part of Anat's retinue and that here they are simply her servitors, pouring rain over her in the course of her ablutions'¹⁸⁷. As described in Chapter I, Ug. *kbkbm* may denote the gods of the pantheon¹⁸⁸.

¹⁸¹ Heb. כוכב, 'star', with a preposition and a m. pl. suffix: BDB 456-7; HALOT 463. Cf. Akk. *kakkabu*: AHw 431; CAD 8[K] 45-9; Ug. *kbkb* (*kkb*): UT §19.1189; WUS no. 1277; DUL 427-8. The Ugaritic designation of 'star' also is used to denote the heavenly beings.

¹⁸² The f. pl. construct form, with a preposition and a 3. m. pl. suffix, of the מסלה, 'highway, track' (BDB 700; HALOT 606), may denote metaphorically the 'course' of the stars.

¹⁸³ Gaster (1950: 212); Caquot-Szzymer (1974: 161 n. e.).

¹⁸⁴ Ug. *rbb*, 'drizzle': DUL 730; de Moor (1971: 83). Cf. Heb. רבירים: HALOT 1178-9; Ar. *rabāb*: AEL 1005. Differently, 'rain': Grabbe (1976: 61); Wyatt (2002: 76).

¹⁸⁵ Ug. *nsk*, 'pour, spill': DUL 644. Cf. Heb. נסך: HALOT 703; Ph., Pun., Aram.: DNWSI 735-6; Akk. *nasāku*: AHw 752; CAD 11/2[N] 15-20.

¹⁸⁶ Thus, Blenkinsopp (1961: 73); Gray (1967: 289); and Boling (1975: 113 n. 20).

¹⁸⁷ Craigie (1977: 34-6). He points out that the stars of Anat may have participated in her warfare as her military deities. Cf. Ug. *mhrk*, 'your (Anat's) warriors', at KTU 1.13.7 and *mhr ʿnt*, 'warriors of Anat', at KTU 1.22 i 9; 1.22 ii 7-8. Craigie (*ibid.*: 36-7) argues that the Gracious Gods, Shahr and Shalem, may be characterised as military deities since they are the sons of Sharpsh, whose epithet occurs as *šbu špš*, the 'army of the sun' (but it is translated as the 'sunset' in the Ugaritic texts: KTU 1.41.47, 53); hence, he suggests that they may 'have

It has been interpreted also as an 'allusion to the participation of the Hebrew warriors'¹⁸⁹. Yet, it seems to indicate the 'celestial host' themselves in order to describe the divine assistance from Yahweh, fighting for the Israelites in the battle¹⁹⁰, in a mythological sense. Thus, the כוכבים (ה) here may be better understood as the divine epithet, which indicates the warrior deities¹⁹¹ of Yahweh, for it is often paralleled with the lesser deities of Yahweh elsewhere (Job 38.7; cf. Ps 148.3) and with his warrior deities (Deut 4.19; Jer 8.2 in a reading of LXX; Dan 8.10; cf. Jer 33.22, which can be compared with Gen 22.27; and Isa 40.26, which can be compared with Ps 147.4)¹⁹². The כוכבי אל, 'Stars of El', in Isa 14.13 also may refer to the מועד, 'divine assembly'¹⁹³.

1.4. 'Camp' (of God/gods) (מחנה (אלהים))

The expression occurs to denote the lesser deities as the divine army of God (Gen 32.2-3¹⁹⁵; 1 Chr 12.23; Ezek 1.24). The idea of the divine army of Yahweh is found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (Jos 5.14; 1 Kgs 22.19-22).

both astral and military characteristics' so that their warlike characteristics may be related to the stars in Judg 5.20.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. KTU 1.3 ii 41; 1.10 i 4; 1.13.13, 17; 1.19 iv 24-5, 31; 1.23.54; 1.43.3; and probably, 1.92.27-8.

¹⁸⁹ Craigie (1978: 380). Also, cf. Craigie (1977: 37): the stars in Judg 5.20 refer to a "form of poetic imagery for the 'army of Yahweh' (*m.yhwh*), and Judges 5:20 describes the participation of the Hebrews themselves in the battle".

¹⁹⁰ Grill (1962: 245); Smend (1970: 82); Miller (1973: 21-3, 98); also, cf. Lind (1980: 70).

¹⁹¹ It is viewed as the divine force of Yahweh: Coppens (1967: 528-31); Lipiński (1967b: 200).

¹⁹² Cf. de Moor (1987: 262 n. 241).

¹⁹³ Cf. Miller (1973: 23).

¹⁹⁴ BDB 334; HALOT 570.

¹⁹⁵ For further discussion of the term in the passages, see 'Genesis 32.2-3' in Chapter V.

1.5. מלאך (יהוה) 'Messenger (of Yahweh)'

The מלאך is used to indicate the 'warrior' or 'destroyer' role of the lesser deities, who perform a judgment on humans (Gen 18¹⁹⁶, 19.1-22; 2 Sam 24.16-7 [|| 1 Chr 21.15]; 1 Chr 21.12; and Ps 78.49):

כי משחתים אנחנו את המקום הזה

For we are about to
destroy¹⁹⁷ this the place

(Gen 19.13a).

Their authority derives from the sender, for the mission is obviously declared: וישלחנו יהוה לשחתה, 'Yahweh sent us to destroy it' (Gen 19.13c). The passage presents explicitly their status as 'agents' of Yahweh¹⁹⁸.

The מלאך יהוה in the story of Balaam in Num 22.22-35 appears as holding a sword. This manifestation may signify his status as a warrior in the context of war. The most evident scene in which the 'warrior' role of the יהוה מלאך appears is described in 2 Kgs 19.35a (cf. Isa 37.36a):

ויהי בלילה ההוא ויצא מלאך יהוה ויך במחנה אשור

פגרים מתים מאה שמונים וחמשה אלף

And it came to pass at the very night that the messenger of
Yahweh came out and he smote¹⁹⁹ in the Assyrian camp one
hundred and eighty-five thousand.

The Messenger of Yahweh obviously takes the 'warrior' role beyond the ordinary 'messenger' role here. Thus it may be said that the divine agent of

¹⁹⁶ The divine messengers who perform a rôle of destroyers are described to appear in an anthropomorphic form: cf. Gen 18.2.

¹⁹⁷ In the episode of the punishment of Sodom, the mission of the messengers is revealed by the H. ptc. masc. pl. form of the שחח, which occurs twice in v. 13 and means 'to ruin, destroy, annihilate, and exterminate' (BDB 1007; HALOT 1469-72). Thus the term indicates their role as 'warriors' or 'destroyers' to demolish the city.

¹⁹⁸ S.R. Driver (1909: 199); Skinner (1910: 308).

¹⁹⁹ The H. impf. 3. m. sg. form, with a ו consecutive, of the נכה, to 'smite': BDB 645; HALOT 697-8. It may suppose a messenger armed with a divine weapon, probably a sword. Cf. 2 Sam 24.16-7 (|| 1 Chr 21.15).

Yahweh may be called the מלאך although he conveys a role in addition to a 'messenger' role. The role of the messenger as a 'warrior' occurs also in Exod 23 and 32.

1.6. ממתים 'Agents of Death'

These figures occur in Job 33.22:

ותקרב לשחת נפשו His soul come near to the pit;
 וחיתו לממתים and his life to the Agents of Death²⁰⁰.

שחת and ממתים are interpreted as 'underworld powers who receive the dead into their domain', (cf. Job 30.23; 33.18), suggesting מות (here and at Job 30.23) as an 'allusion to the mythic Mot'²⁰¹. Yet, the ממתים are, more probably, identified as 'destroyers', who are 'angels that bring death'²⁰² (2 Sam 24.16; 2 Kgs 19.35; 1 Chr 21.15; Ps 78.49). Whilst Ug. *mtm(tm)*, 'the dead', paralleled with Ug. *rpum* and the *ilnym*, 'divine ones', indicate the dead and deified kings in the Ugaritic texts²⁰³, the ממתים in the text may be interpreted as the plural deities who bring death²⁰⁴.

1.7. משחית (משחחים) 'Destroyer(s)'

The משחית appears in Exod 12.23:

ופסח יהוה על הפתח ולא יתן המשחית לבא אל בתיכם לנגף

Yahweh will pass over the door and will not allow the

²⁰⁰ The H. ptc. m. pl. form, with a preposition, of the מוח, to 'die': HALOT 562-4; 653. Cf. Ug. *mt*: UT §19.1443; WUS 1703; DUL 595-6; Aram. *mwt*, Amm., Pun. *mt*: DNWSI 605-7; Akk. *mātu*: AHw 633-4; CAD 10/1[M] 421-7. Differently, 'to death': Tur-Sinai (1957: 471); 'to waters of Death': Pope (1973: 246, 251).

²⁰¹ Habel (1985: 469).

²⁰² A.B. Davidson (1889: 230). Hartley (1988: 442, 444 n. 21) identifies them as "the messengers of death", "who have the duty of transporting a deceased person to the pit".

²⁰³ See discussion of this matter in 'Rapi'uma' in Part I above.

²⁰⁴ Cf. 'messengers of death' (NIV); 'executioners' (NKJV).

destroyer²⁰⁵ to come into²⁰⁶ your houses to smite (you).

It may refer to a destroyer deity of Yahweh, who is to be sent to smite the Egyptians²⁰⁷. It may be related to the destroyer deity described elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, it is mentioned in Jer 51.1, 25. It also occurs in 2 Kgs 23.13, where the reference to הר המשחית implies a mythological imagery of a mountain²⁰⁸. In 2 Sam 24.16-7, the destroyer (המשחית) is identified with the messenger (המלאך) of Yahweh (cf. 2 Kgs 19.35). Thus the משחית is regarded as the agent of Yahweh²⁰⁹.

1.8. 'צבא' (Host)

The 'צבא', 'Host'²¹⁰, appears as a military term in the Hebrew Bible²¹¹, as it is attested in other Semitic cognates²¹². With this sense, it may indicate the military function of celestial beings. This military designation is combined with other terms in order to denote the celestial power: hence, as צבא השמים, 'Host of the heavens'²¹³, or as צבא יהוה, 'Host of Yahweh'²¹⁴ (cf. Ps 103.21:

²⁰⁵ The H. ptc. m. sg. form, with an article, of the שחח, to 'ruin, destroy, annihilate': BDB 1007; HALOT 1469-72. It has a substantive function here to indicate the agent deity of Yahweh.

²⁰⁶ Lit., 'to in'.

²⁰⁷ Thus, 'emissary' of Yahweh: Durham (1987: 163).

²⁰⁸ Cogan-Tadmor (1988: 289) identify הר המשחית as the Mount of Olives, where Solomon's altars for pagan gods were situated (1 Kgs 11.5-7).

²⁰⁹ Clements (1972: 73); Hyatt (1980: 137).

²¹⁰ Heb. צבא, 'army, host, war, warfare': BDB 838; HALOT 994-7.

²¹¹ Thus as a meaning of 'war, warfare': Num 31.36; or as 'army': Deut 24.5.

²¹² Cf. Akk. *šabā'u*, *šābu*: AHw 1972; CAD 16[Š] 41, 46-55; Ug. *šb²*, *šbu*: UT §19.2138; WUS no. 2299; DUL 777 (I); Eth. *šabā'i(t)*: Leslau (1987: 544).

²¹³ Cf. 1 Kgs 22.19 (|| 2 Chr 18.18); Isa 34.4; Jer 8.2; 33.22; and Dan 8.10. The השמים צבא may be compared with the Ugaritic expression *šmym*, 'Heavenly Ones', which is paralleled with *kbkkm*, 'Stars'; cf. discussion under the category of *pḥr kkbm* 'Assembly of Stars' in Chapter I. It is also paralleled with כוכבים (ה), the 'Stars' in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 4.19; Ps 103.3; Jer 8.2 (LXX); and Dan 8.10. Niehr (1999: 428) points out that "Due to a semantic shift, host of heaven also designates the divine assembly gathered around Yahweh, the heavenly king"; and he also argues (*ibid.*: 428-9) that the Israelite conception of a 'host of

כל צבאו, 'all his Hosts', etc.). For instance, in 1 Sam 17.45, the יהוה צבאות is used with the expression אלהי מערכות ישראל, 'God of ranks of Israel', in a conceptional contrast; sc. the celestial army of Yahweh and the earthly army of Saul. But the texts describe the fact that they are both proclaimed to be united under the same control of their supreme warrior god.

1.9. קדישין 'Holy Ones'

The divine entities, whose title occurs as קדישין, 'Holy Ones'²¹⁵, take a warrior role in the vision of Daniel (Dan 7.21, 22)²¹⁶. Noth argues that the holy ones in v. 21 are human beings²¹⁷. However, the text is to be read in the mythological context (cf. Dan 8.9-12)²¹⁸. The holy ones in Dan 7 indicate explicitly divine beings.

1.10. שׂנאן 'Archers'

The text of Ps 68.18 [ET 17] states Yahweh as having enormous armed forces composed of charioteers:

heaven' has been developed from astral spheres; hence, צבאם in Gen 2.1 may be related to celestial spheres, as being under the domination of Yahweh.

²¹⁴ Cf. Josh 5.14, 15. An epithet of Yahweh is known as יהוה צבאות, which occurs 284 times in the Hebrew Bible: Mettinger (1999c: 920, 921). According to Kautzsch (1886: 17), the expression occurs frequently in the prophetic books (245 times). Eichrodt (1961: 192) says that it is a "favorite designation for God as warrior". It may be translated as 'Yahweh of Hosts' (cf. Mettinger, *ibid.*: 920). For further discussion of the expression, cf. Zobel (2003: 224-31). He is also called יהוה אלהי (ה) צבאות, 'Yahweh God of Hosts' (Ps 89.9; Hos 12.6; Amos 3.13; and 6.14, etc.).

²¹⁵ The adj. m. pl. form of the Aram. קדיש, to 'be sacred, holy': HALOT 1966. Cf. Heb. קדש: HALOT 1076-8.

²¹⁶ V. 21 reads וקרנא דכן עברה קרב עם קדישין, 'this horn is making war with the holy ones'.

²¹⁷ Noth (1967: 226).

²¹⁸ Collins (1993: 319-20) points out that "the attack in chap. 8 is clearly on the heavenly host, symbolized by the stars"; it also occurs against heavenly beings in Dan 11.36 (cf. 7.21). He concludes that "these events are understood as an assault on the heavenly host and ultimately on God himself".

רכב אלהים רבתיים אלפי שנאן Chariots²¹⁹ of God are twice ten
thousand²²⁰; (there are)
thousands of XXX;
ארני במ סיני בקרש Lord is in²²¹ Sinai among the
Holy Ones²²².

The second term of the *אלפי שנאן* occurs here as a hapax legomenon, and its root has been suggested variously. LXX reads it as *εὐθηγοῦντων*, 'rejoicing ones', which may presuppose Heb. *שִׂאֵן*²²³. It has been taken also as military troops (*צבאות*)²²⁴. More recent positions have been proposed as a repetition²²⁵,

²¹⁹ The sg. form of the *רכב*, 'chariot, group of chariots, chariot crews' (BDB 939; HALOT 1233-5), may be here translated in a collective sense (2 Kgs 6.17; cf. Isa 66.15; Hab 3.8). A.A. Anderson (1972: [1] 491) comments that "The 'chariots of God' may refer to the heavenly armies which accompany Yahweh".

²²⁰ The hapax legomenon f. dual form of Heb. *רבו(א)*, 'ten thousand, myriad' (BDB 914; HALOT 1178) seems to indicate the numerous number of chariots of Yahweh, rather than its worth (Dahood, 1966-70: [2] 142). Cf. Deut 33.2-3.

²²¹ It may be construed as a *ב* plus an enclitic *ם* (ballast form of *ב*). Differently, Dahood (1966-70: [2] 131, 143) reconstructs terms as *ארן יבם*, 'who created', relating *ארן* to Ug. *ybm*, found in the epithet of Anat *ybm̄t limm̄.*, 'the creatress of the peoples'. Cf. Albright (1938b: 19 n. 6); Gordon (1965: §19.1065): 'progenitress'. Ug. *ybm̄t* has been read also as 'sister-in-law': G.R. Driver (1956: 166); del Olmo (1981: 557); del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 951). Yet these translations are rejected by Wyatt (1992: 417-9) who interprets it as 'Dove of Lim (sc. Baal)', related to Ar. *yamamat*, 'pigeon, dove'; Anat appears as winged (KTU 1.10 ii 10; 1.108.8f.; cf. KTU 1.18 iv 21f.); Ug. *lim*, related to the *l̄y*, which is attested in Ug. *aliyn*, is regarded as the title of Baal. Thus Wyatt (2002: 75 and n. 32) renders the epithet into 'the Beloved of the Powerful One', and recognises that a kinship explanation of the epithet, as argued by Walls (1992: 94-107), is not related to the theological importance.

²²² The *בקרש* denotes another group of divine beings who surround Yahweh. Differently, it has been read as 'in holiness': NASB; NJPS; 'as his sanctuary': Dahood (1966-70: [2] 131); Kraus (1988-9: [2] 44); and 'from Qadesh': Gray (1977: 23).

²²³ As one manuscript reads (BHS).

²²⁴ *ס* reads *dhjl̄*, rendering '(thousands of) hosts'. Also, cf. *ס*.

²²⁵ BDB. It has been suggested to be derived from the *שנה*, to 'repeat, do the second time' (GHLOTS 839): hence, NASB, NIV, NJB, NJPS, NRSV; and Tate (1990: 166).

or as a derivation from Ar. *saniya*, to 'be high in rank'²²⁶, or Ar. *šanā*, to 'shine, be bright'²²⁷.

Meanwhile, it has been related, possibly, to Ug. *tnn*, 'archer' (KTU 1.14 ii 38)²²⁸: Albright has referred to it as 'warrior'²²⁹. However, as he has also admitted, its translation as 'warrior' seems to be 'slightly too broad'. Hence, the אלפי שׂנאן in MT may be rendered as 'thousands of Archers'²³⁰. Thus it portrays divine archers themselves manned in chariots as warriors.

In any case, the phrase connotes myriads of 'lesser deities'²³¹ as the armed force of Yahweh here²³². As a military imagery, the chariots here are reminiscent of the visions of Elisha in 2 Kgs 6.13-7 (cf. 2.11)²³³. They may be related to the military activity of the lesser deities of Yahweh (cf. 2 Kgs 7.6; and Hab 3.8).

²²⁶ AEL 1448-50.

²²⁷ AEL 1448-50.

²²⁸ UT §19.2708; WUS no. 2900; DUL 922-3; W.A. Ward (1961: 39); Gibson (1978: 160); Wyatt (2002: 190 n. 64). Cf. Akk. *šanannu*: AHw 1161; CAD 17/1[Š] 366.

²²⁹ Albright (1950-1: 14, 24-5, 38; also, 1955: 2-4) omitted the א from the term שׂנאן because of dittography, and construed the original phrase as שׂנאן אדני, 'Thousands the warriors of my Lord'. Cf. Albright (1950-1: 25): "it was certainly a class of warriors which formed a recognized element in the general population". Albright's initial suggestion has been followed by others: Miller (1973: 108-9); Dahood (1966-70: [2] 142-3); and Gray (1977: 12, 23). Differently, it is read from the שׂנאן, to 'shine': Caquot (1970: 164-5).

²³⁰ Cf. Dahood (1966-70: [2] 131, 142-3); Gray (1977: 12).

²³¹ Thus, KJV renders it into 'angels'.

²³² Miller (1973: 109) remarks that "here the march of Yahweh and his hosts into battle is unmistakably present. 'Chariots' can hardly refer to Israel's army at any early stage in her history; it is obviously the divine army here which marches forth to fight for Israel".

²³³ In v. 17, the fiery imagery of chariots and horses is related to the theophany of Yahweh. But the chariots and horses may be identified as the vehicles of Yahweh's lesser deities rather than Yahweh himself (Cogan-Tadmor, 1988: 32).

This designation may signify a class of deities who occupy a significant position among other heavenly deities, probably a specifically authorised rank²³⁵.

In Josh 5.13-15 it is applied to an anonymous chief-warrior who appeared before Joshua as the commander of the divine army: שר צבא יהוה, 'Prince of the host of Yahweh' (v. 14; cf. Dan 8.11)²³⁶. This divine figure is mentioned as grasping a sword withdrawn from a sheath: וחרבו שלופה בידו, 'and his drawn²³⁷ sword in his hand' (v. 13). The appearance of this figure has been identified as a theophany of Yahweh; some say that the divine being was Yahweh himself²³⁸. Yet the identity of the divine being is seen more probably as a chief warrior deity of Yahweh²³⁹, as the text explains his title as שר צבא יהוה.

The text describes how Joshua prostrates himself before this divine figure (v. 14). It may denote the fact that the rank of a mortal is lesser than a divine agent of Yahweh. Hence, Joshua is commanded to respond to him by taking off his shoes from his feet:

של נעלך מעל רגלך כי המקום אשר אתה עמך עליו קדש הוא

²³⁴ Heb. שר; 'chieftain, chief, ruler, captain, prince, representative of the king, official': BDB 978-9; HALOT 1350-3. For its cognates, cf. Ug. šr: UT §19.2477; WUS no. 2680; DUL 843 (III); Ph., Aram. šr: DNWSI 1190-1; Akk. šarru(m): AHw 1188-90; CAD 17/2[Š] 76-114.

²³⁵ For instances of the divine title of the high rank, see Dan 10.13, 12.1; Josh 5.14-5; and cf. Dan 8.11 (Yahweh as the שר הצבא) and 25 (Yahweh as the שר שרים). Cf. Isa 9.5 (שלום שר). They are suggested as the 'group of superior angels' (sc. 'archangels' in the later Gk. expression): S.R. Driver (1900: 158).

²³⁶ The motif of the unexpected encounter of a mortal with a deity is found frequently in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 18.32; 32.22-3, etc.

²³⁷ The Q. pass. ptc. f. sg. form of the שרף, to 'draw out, off': BDB 1025; HALOT 1543. Cf. Akk. šalāpu(m): AHw 1145-6; CAD 17/1[Š] 230-1; Ar. salaba: AEL 1398-400. It can be implied that he is dressed in his full military attire as a highly ranked officer, although his appearance is mentioned simply as being in a human form: איש, a 'man' (v. 13).

²³⁸ Gray (1967: 71-2); Woudstra (1981: 105-6).

²³⁹ Soggin (1972: 78); Miller-Tucker (1974: 26); and Boling (1975: 199).

‘Pull off your shoe from your foot, for the place where you are standing on it (is) holy itself’

(Josh 5.15b).

This scene evokes the theophanic setting in Exod 3.5; Moses is ordered by the messenger god of Yahweh to take off his shoes from his feet, for the place that he is standing on is holy (Exod 3.5). Thus, both descriptions may illustrate the higher rank of an agent deity to a human.

Summary

The divine titles of warrior deities in the Hebrew Bible occur as גבורים, אבירים, שנאן, קדישין, צבא(ות), משחית, ממחים, מלאך (יהוה), מחנה (אלהים), כוכבים, שר, etc. Similar to the Ugaritic titles of warrior deities, the metaphorical expressions are adopted to denote a class of warrior deities whose number is large. The terms also indicate their lesser rank in the hierarchical divine assembly.

2. Named Warrior Deity in the Hebrew Bible

2.1. מיכאל, ‘Michael’

The name of an “archangel”, מיכאל, described only in Dan 10.13, 21, and 12.1²⁴⁰, denotes ‘Who-(Is)-Like-El?’ and it is attested as a common name in

²⁴⁰ Michael is mentioned by name in a list of seven archangels (as four in Enoch 9.1; or as seven in Enoch 20.5: thus, Uriel, Raphael, Raguel, Michael, Sariel, Gabriel, and Remiel; but, in Ezekiel 9.2-11, six men (divine beings) and one, who has in the midst of them manifested; thus, the number of archangels as seven seems more plausible). For the NT references on Michael, see Jude 9 (as the one contending with the devil over the body of Moses); and Rev 12 (as the chief-warrior deity in the divine war with his divine messengers against the devil and his own divine messengers).

biblical references²⁴¹ and in some extra-biblical references²⁴². Dan 10.13 further describes his military function:

והנה מיכאל אחד השרים הראשנים בא לעזרני

And lo, Michael, one²⁴³ of the chief Princes²⁴⁴ came to help²⁴⁵ me.

A celestial battle has taken place here. His name occurs also as a co-operator with another chief divine agent, perhaps Gabriel, for the mission. In Dan 10.21b, his function is described more magnificently:

ואין אחד מתחזק עמי על אלה כי אם מיכאל שרכם

And there is no one strengthening²⁴⁶ himself with me against these, except²⁴⁷ Michael your Prince²⁴⁸.

Another of his roles is as the guardian deity or protector deity of the Israelites²⁴⁹; thus Dan 12.1 reads: יעמד מיכאל השר הגדול העמד על בני עמך,

²⁴¹ The name has been used frequently for the name of humans elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible: Num 13.13; 1 Chr 5.13, 14; 6.25; 7.3; 8.16; 27.18; 2 Chr 21.2; and Ezra 8.8.

²⁴² It is attested in the Ebla. cognate: *mi-kà-il* or *mi-ki-il*; cf. Pettinato (1981: 63, 261). Dahood (1981: 276-7) suggests interestingly that the ending *-il* of the *mi-kà-il*, 'Who is like El?' corresponds obviously to the ending *-ya* (the Ebla. cognate of the Hebrew forms; *yāh*, *yāhû*, *yô?*): *mi-kà-yà*, 'Who is like Ya?'. If it is, then the terms of the Heb. מיכאל and the Ebla. *mi-kà-il* or *mi-ki-il* may express the same theology: the absolute ontology of the god. It is found also in an Aramaic ostrakon excavated at Nimrud (Kalhu): Segal (1958); Albright (1958).

²⁴³ Or 'the first'.

²⁴⁴ A description in Ps 82.7 supports the fact that there are other entities of the שר in the divine hierarchy.

²⁴⁵ The inf. construct form, with a preposition and a 1. c. sg. suffix, of the עזר, to 'help, assist': BDB 740; HALOT 810-1 (I). Cf. Ph., Pun., Aram. ʿzr: DNWSI 836; Ug. ʿdr: UT §19.1831; WUS no. 2115; DUL 153; Ar. ʿaḏara: AEL 1983-7; Akk. ḫāziru: AHw 339; CAD 6[H] 166. Cf. *il tʿdr*, Ugaritic 'Helper-gods', discussed above.

²⁴⁶ The Hithpael, ptc. form of the חזק, to 'be or grow firm, strong, strengthen': BDB 304; HALOT 302-4. In paradoxical terms Michael is expressed as the only divine agent who can strengthen himself to help other lesser deities powerfully and effectively.

²⁴⁷ After a negative address the אם כי limits the preceding clause and leads to the idea of an exception: BDB 474.

²⁴⁸ LXX reads ἄγγελος, 'messenger'.

'Michael, the great prince, *who* is standing over sons of your people, will stand²⁵⁰'.

Since his epithet, שר, also denotes mortal dignitaries (cf. Judg 4.2; 1 Sam 17.55), it can be applied also to indicate the hierarchical ranking of lesser deities. Furthermore these references may signify the idea that there is a clear hierarchical distinction between the ordinary lesser deities and the archangels.

Summary

The named warrior deity in the Hebrew Bible appears to be מיכאל, 'Michael' (Dan 10.13, 21; 12.1), one of the chief princes (אחד השרים הראשנים) of Yahweh. Michael is described to be superlatively strong (Dan 10.21b). He takes the role of the divine guardian of the Israelites (Dan 12.1). His divine epithet, שר, (Dan 10.21b), distinguishes his position from other ordinary lesser deities. He is revealed further as the warrior deity in the biblical descriptions.

Conclusion to Chapter IV

Similar to the Ugaritic descriptions, lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible function as warrior deities. Whilst the Ugaritic texts inform that there are some named warrior deities (e.g., Qadesh-and-Amurr; Yatipan), the Hebrew descriptions also address Michael, whose hierarchical level is to be higher than the other ordinary deities. The Ugaritic named warrior or messenger deities are suggested as the prototype of archangels in the Hebrew Bible.

In any event, the divine titles of warrior deities in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible indicate the hierarchical structure of the divine world

²⁴⁹ S.R. Driver (1900: 157); Collins (1993: 375, 6).

²⁵⁰ Collins (1993: 390) interestingly suggests that Michael's standing position may indicate a judicial setting in the divine court. He concludes that "although Michael's exact role in Dan 12:1 is not specified, it may be understood as judicial advocate or executor of the judgment or both".

consisting of two main groups: the higher deities and the other lesser deities who serve them. In the Hebrew Bible, there appears a certain group of the deities of the higher rank. Among them, Michael stands between Yahweh the supreme god of the divine assembly and the other lesser deities.

CHAPTER FIVE:

Other Lesser Deities in the Ugaritic Texts and the Hebrew Bible

Introduction

From the previous chapters we have observed that there are mainly two kinds of lesser deity: divine messengers and divine warriors. However, in addition to these lesser deities, the Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew texts also contain the idea that several other lesser deities play roles other than those of messengers and warriors.

Thus, this chapter is concerned with the miscellaneous roles of the lesser deities found in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible, where they may be identified as mediators, guardians, chanters, or servants. The research will scrutinise the Ugaritic and Hebrew texts relevant to these miscellaneous roles, with a philological and textual approach¹. Some Akkadian texts will be suggested also for the enquiries when they are related to our subject².

¹ Selected Ugaritic texts for the research in Part I will be KTU 1.1 iv 15-17; 1.2 iii 20-21; 1.3 i 2-6; 1.3 ii 4-5; 1.6 iv 22-4; 1.12 i 14-7; 1.17 i 1-3; 1.23.12; 1.23.56-57; 2.13.1-8; 5.9 i 4-6, etc. In Part II, some biblical Hebrew texts will be studied as well: Gen 32.2-3; Exod 23.20-23; Job 16.19-21; 33.23-4; 38.7; Ps 91.11-2; Ps 103.19-21; and 148.1-3, etc.

² Thus, RS 20.17.5; RS 20.255 A 2-3; RS 17.152.5; RS 17.83.6-7; and RS 16.111.4-5, etc.

In the Ugaritic texts, many deities take various roles or a single role in one setting. In this part the study will expose their diverse roles represented as mediators, guardians, chanters, or servants.

1. Mediator Deities in the Ugaritic Texts

In the Ugaritic texts, the lesser gods appear as the mediators between the higher gods and humans. Hence, in the poem of *Aqhat* (KTU 1.17), the lesser deities receive the food provided by a man; thus Danel, who has the double epithet, *mt rpi ... mt hrnmy*, offers food and drink to the gods (*ilm*) for six days in order to obtain divine assistance³; they are all identified as *bn qdš*, 'Sons of the Holy One', which is used as a parallel synonym for Ug. *ilm*:

<i>[*apnk dnil mt rp]i</i>	[Then ⁴ Danel, the man of Rapi]u ⁵ ,
<i>aph<n> ġzr [mt hrnmy]</i>	afterwards the hero, [the man of
	<i>Hrnm</i> ⁶ ,]
<i>uzr ilm ylh̄m</i>	enrobed ⁷ , fed the gods,

³ Wyatt (1996: 25) points out that "one of the original purposes of sacrifice ... would have been to feed the gods, to give them the physical strength to perform their duties (as well as binding them to their worshippers in an act of commensality)".

⁴ Ug. *apnk* is suggested to take place here and to have a parallel with Ug. *aph<n>* in the following line for the formulaic introduction: Husser (1996: 85).

⁵ Jirku (1962: 116) and Gibson (1978: 103). Cf. || KTU 1.20 ii [7]. Ug. *rpu* is a nominative of *rpi*, which has been supposed here as a DN of the god that occurs in KTU 1.108. The meaning of the DN can be guessed easily from its Hebrew cognate רפא, to 'heal' (HALOT 1272-4). Cf. Rouillard (1999: 692-3): the 'man of healing'. On the Ugaritic god Rapiu, see Parker (1972), de Moor (1976), M.S. Smith (1992), and Rouillard (1999). Cf. Caquot (1985: 351): the 'title of a god known under another name, or a particular deity'. In any event, the epithet has a religious sense for him: Wyatt (2002: 250 n. 5). Differently, it has been taken as a TN (Margalit, 1989a: 143, 251-60).

⁶ Ug. *hrnmy*; an undefined DN (**hrnm*), probably. Cf. Wyatt (2002: 250 n. 5).

[uzr yšqy]bn qdš

[enrobed, offered⁸] the sons of the
Holy One [to drink]

(KTU 1.17 i 1-3).

Danel's hospitality to the gods may be regarded as his ritual performance⁹. Thus the locale of this ritual banquet to the gods may be in the sanctuary. In this episode his son is expected to be obliged to do something for the gods and their house:

nšb skn ilibh b qdš

(the) one who shall erect¹⁰ (the) stela¹¹ of
his ancestral god¹² in (the) sanctuary,

⁷ Ug. *uzr* may be taken here as a G. pass. ptc. form of the Ug. $\sqrt{2}zr$, to 'gird, bind' (DUL 137): Wyatt (2002: 251 n. 6). It perhaps indicates the idea that Danel is wearing a ritual garment (KTU 1.17 i 7, 9, 10, 12; as *uzrm*, 21, 22); cf. Aistleitner (1964: 67); del Olmo (1981: 367).

⁸ Ug. *yšqy* is read at this place as a G. causative; Dijkstra-de Moor (1975:173); accepted by Wyatt (2002: 251 n. 7). Its parallel term *ylhm* is construed as a D. 3. m. sg. form of the verbal $\sqrt{lh}m$, to 'eat, feed' (DUL 495-6 [I]), which has also the causative sense; Gibson (1978: 150); Pardee (1997: 343 n. 2); thus, the grammatical subject of the two verbs should be Danel.

⁹ The feeding of other skilful goddesses (*ktrt*), which could be construed as a sacrifice to the lesser deities, occurs also in KTU 1.17 ii 27-39.

¹⁰ Ug. *nšb*, to 'erect, put, fix': DUL 646. Cf. Heb. נָצַב: HALOT 714-5; Pun., Aram. *nšb*: DNWSI 749-50; Akk. *našābu*: AHw 755; CAD 11/1[N] 33; Ar. *našaba*: AEL 2799-801. Whilst it may be construed as a ptc. finite form or inf. absolute form here, it seems most probably to be a ptc. m. sg. form (Sivan, 2001: 143), taking Ug. *bnh*, 'his son', and *šrš*, 'offspring', in line 25 as its semantic subjects. As a relative clause, cf. Caquot-Szzyner (1974: 421): 'qui érigeria'; del Olmo (1981: 368). Also, cf. Gibson (1978: 105): 'one to stand'; Boda (1993: 12-3), relating it to a BH niph'al form. 'Shall' would make the better translation, delivering an obligatory mood of the verb to indicate a son's duty. Cf. Wyatt (2002: 255 and n. 24): 'He shall set up'.

¹¹ Ug. *skn*, 'stela': Jirku (1962: 116); Caquot-Szzyner (1974: 421); del Olmo (1981: 368, 595); DUL 759 (II). Cf. Akk. *šiknu*: AHw 1234-5; CAD 17/2[Š] 436-9. See Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 175): 'stelae' here. Differently, 'statue': Aistleitner (1964: 68); 'Verwalter': WUS no. 1909; 'stela, steward': UT §19.1754; 'steward': Gibson (1978: 105); 'the *skn*-(care-?) offering': Healey (1979: 354); to 'care for': Boda (1993: 13). For further discussion of a stela (a raised stone monument) at Ugarit, cf. Wyatt (2002: 255 n. 25).

¹² Ug. *ilib*, with a 3. m. sg. suffix, denotes literally the 'god of (the) father' (sc. the ancestral god): DUL 52 (I). It occurs also in the Pantheon Lists: KTU 1.47.2 (|| KTU 1.118.1; cf.

The term *qdš* is used here to describe the holy place in the sense of the 'sacred precinct'¹⁵. Hence, Ug. *qdš* at KTU 1.17 i 26 and 44 denotes a 'sanctuary' rather than a 'cemetery' as Margalit has viewed it¹⁶.

The sanctuary, the temple at Ugarit, signifies the cosmic centre of all the deities: the supreme god El, his son Baal, and the anonymous gods as divine mediators. Thus the interaction of the lesser deities between the human and the higher deity is exposed in the context of the text: after this ritual banquet, the gods in the temple took on their role as the divine mediators delivering Danel's prayer to Baal in order to have him come into the temple; it made Baal intercede with El on behalf of Danel. Thus the role of the lesser deities, whose titles are represented as *ilm*, 'gods', and *bn qdš*, 'sons of Holy Ones', is taken here as that of the divine mediators bridging the gap between the human and the higher gods.

It is also confirmed in KTU 1.19 iv 22-25 and 29-31; Danel has offered a

RS 20.24.1). It would be another discussable matter if the divine title in the Pantheon Lists indicates the ancestral god in KTU 1.17 i 26. It is not certain whether it denotes the 'deified ancestor' (*DUL* *ibid.*) or the 'special deity of a clan': sc. the 'deity of the ancestor' (Pardee, 1997: 344 n. 6). For further discussion of the identity of the *ilib*, cf. Wyatt (2002: 256 n. 26 and 360 n. 2).

¹³ Ug. *ztr*, 'cippus, votive stele': del Olmo (1981: 368); *DUL* 1001-2. Tsevat (1971: 351-2) interprets it as a 'sun emblem', interestingly relating to the 'winged sun disk'; thus, Dijkstra-de Moor (1975: 175); Pardee (1997: 344 and n. 7). For various other suggestions, cf. Wyatt (2002: 256 n. 28). Ug. *skn ilibh* and *ztr ʿmh* occur here to be the paralleled direct objects of the verb *nšb*.

¹⁴ Ug. *ʿm*, 'lineage, ancestors': *DUL* 163. Cf. Heb. עַם: *HALOT* 837-9; Ph., Pun. Aram. ʿm: *DNWSI* 864-6; Ar. ʿmm: *AEL* 2149. Differently, 'kinsman': Wyatt (2002: 256 and n. 29).

¹⁵ Cf. Margalit (1989a: 271); Wyatt (2002: 256 n. 27).

¹⁶ Margalit (1989a: 271). Wyatt (2002: 256 and n. 27) remarks that "stelae were found especially in association with the temples at Ugarit" and adds that "Tombs were beneath the floors of individual houses at Ugarit, though the dolmen-groups of the Golan may have constituted collective burial-grounds".

sacrifice to the lesser deities, who are expected to function as the mediator gods in order to obtain help from the supreme god El, who is described as *ab*, 'father' (KTU 1.19 iv 29). Their status as lesser deities is revealed with their paralleled designations: *ilm*, 'gods'; *šmym*, 'heavenly ones'; and *kbkbm*, 'stars'.

It may have been the religious consciousness of the ancient Ugaritians that the mediator deities will deliver humans' prayers that take place in the sacred place to the higher deities who will answer their prayer. They will then come to meet the humans as the result of their prayer or ritual and the place of their theophany will be in the holy place (*b qdš*).

Summary

Ugaritic lesser deities, who are represented as *ilm*, 'gods', or *bn qdš*, 'Sons of Holy One', take their role as mediator deities between the higher gods and humans (KTU 1.19 iv 22-25, 29-31). In Ugaritic religion, the lesser deities are the objects of human worship.

2. Guardian Deities in the Ugaritic Texts

This research will examine the guardian deities that occur in the Akkadian epistles excavated from Ugarit and Ugaritic mythic texts. The guardian deities are mentioned mostly in correspondence with ancient Ugaritians¹⁷.

2.1. Guardian Deities in the Epistle Formula

In diplomatic epistles, the speech of a sender is sometimes embellished with an expression of a personal wish for divine guidance. A mention of guardian deities, a sender's wishes for their protection, and peace for a recipient are

¹⁷ The greeting formulas in the Ugaritic epistles have been studied constantly: Ginsberg (1938b); Loewenstamm (1969); Pardee (1977); Brooke (1979); and Cunchillos (1983). For the epistolary correspondence of the Ugaritians, see Nougayrol (1968: 101-2, 120-9, 139-50, and 166-7); also, cf. Nougayrol (1955; 1956; 1965; and 1970).

addressed especially in the salutation of the epistles of the Ugaritians¹⁸. Cunchillos says that the motif of the guardian deities is adopted as an expression of faith and piety of the sender in the salutations of the letters¹⁹. Although any DN could be addressed in the salutation of letters, the gods addressed in the salutation are regarded as taking the role of the guardian deities that are supposed to protect the recipient(s):

<i>l mkl̥t umy rgm</i>	To the queen, my mother, say:
<i>t̥hm mlk bnk</i>	'the message of the king, your son:
<i>l p^hn umy qlt</i>	"At the feet of my mother, I prostrate myself.
<i>l umy yšlm</i>	To my mother may peace be ²⁰ ;
<i>ilm tgrk tšlmk</i>	may the gods protect you ²¹ (and) give you peace ²² ''

(KTU 2.13.1-8).

The expression *ilm tgrk tšlmk* is an idiom that occurs most frequently in the Ugaritic epistles²³. It appears as the typical formula in the salutation of the diplomatic epistles. The sequence of verbs functions here as the formula of greeting: *l-PN yšlm ilm tgrk tšlmk*, 'to PN (the recipient) may peace be; may the gods protect you (and) give you peace'²⁴. It is stressed sometimes by revealing the identity of the gods more clearly:

¹⁸ A.L. Christensen (1977: 150; 1984: 122-3).

¹⁹ Cunchillos (1984: 115-28).

²⁰ The G. 3. m. sg. form of Ug. *√šlm*, to 'be well, do well, be in peace': *DUL* 817-8. Cf. Heb. שָׁלוֹם: *HALOT* 1532-6; Ph., Pun., Aram. *šlm*: *DNWSI* 1144-6; Akk. *šalāmu*: *AHw* 1143; *CAD* 17/1[Š] 208-29; Ar. *salima*: *AEL* 1412-7.

²¹ The G. 3. m. pl. form, with a 2. sg. suffix, of the Ug. *√ngr*, to 'protect, guard': Dietrich-Loretz (1967-8: 307 n. 26); *DUL* 624-5.

²² Cf. 'keep you healthy': del Olmo-Sanmartín (2004: 818).

²³ Cf. Cunchillos (1983: 72; 1989: 254-7). Thus, it is seen as a traditional epistolary form used by the Ugaritians: Cunchillos (1981b: 46).

²⁴ KTU 2.1.1-2; 2.4.4-5; 2.6.4-6; 2.16.4-6; 2.21.4-6; 2.30.5-7; 2.34.3-4; 2.38.4-5; 2.41.1-2; 2.44.4-5; 2.63.4-6; 2.68.8-10; 2.71.3-5; and 2.72.5-6; and, without *l-PN yšlm*, cf. KTU 2.11.7-9;

<i>yšlm lk</i>	May peace be to you;
<i>ily ugrt tgrk tšlmk</i>	may the gods of Ugarit protect you (and)
	give you peace

(KTU 2.16.4-6).

The gods are invoked here to protect humans and preserve their peace²⁵. The additional term *tʿzzk* for the further wish may follow the formula²⁶:

<i>tʿzzk</i>	May they strengthen ²⁷ you
<i>alp ymm w rbt šnt</i>	(for) thousands of days and myriads of years

(KTU 5.9 i 4-6)²⁸.

The idea of divine protection is also formulated in some Akkadian letters excavated from Ugarit:

<i>ilānu liššuruka</i>	May the gods protect you ²⁹ ;
<i>ilānu ana šulmani liššuruka</i>	may the gods protect you (in)
	health ³⁰ .

These additionally described phrases are found as well:

<i>lim ilānu liššuruka</i>	May the one thousand gods
	protect you ³¹ ;

2.14.4-5; 2.50.1; 2.70.6-7; and 5.9 i 2-3. For further discussion on the greeting formula in letters, cf. Cunchillos (1989: 251-60).

²⁵ Cunchillos (1984: 126).

²⁶ Cf. Loewenstamm (1969: 52 n. 6).

²⁷ The D. 3. m. pl. form, with a 2. suffix, of the Ug. $\sqrt{tʿzz}$, to 'be strong, have power, strengthen': DUL 197. Cf. Heb. עָזַז: HALOT 808-9; Aram. $\sqrt{tʿzz}$: DNWSI 835; Akk. *ezēzu*: AHw 269-70; CAD 4[E] 427-8; Ar. $\sqrt{tʿzza}$: AEL 2030-3.

²⁸ Cf. KTU 2.4.6. Also, cf. Ps 29.11: יהוה עז לעמו יתן יהוה יברך את עמו בשלום, 'Yahweh will give strength to his people; Yahweh will bless his people with peace'.

²⁹ RS 20.17.5 (Ug 5: 128); RS 20.158.5 (Ug 5: 139); and RS 21.183.5 (Ug 5: 124).

³⁰ RS 20.255 A 2-3 (Ug 5: 101); RS 21.07 C 1-2 (Ug 5: 165); and, cf. RS 20.15.6-7 (Ug 5: 143): 'liššuruma'. Cf. its similar expression *ilānū^M ana šulmani liššuru^{ru}ka*, 'May the gods protect you (in) health': RS 15.77.5-6 (PRU 3: 6); RS 11.730.5-6 (PRU 3: 12); RS 17.78.5 (PRU 4: 196); RS 17.286.5 (PRU 4: 180); and RS 17.424 C 7-8 (PRU 4: 219). For its variations, see Loewenstamm (1969: 53 and nn. 8-11).

³¹ RS 17.152.5 (PRU 4: 214); RS 18.89.5 (PRU 6: 17).

lim ilânu ana šulmani liššuruka may the one thousand gods
protect you (in) health³².

Whilst the expression 'one thousand gods' has been used commonly in the international correspondence³³, especially and evidently between the Ugaritic and Amorite rulers, it may represent the guardian gods of Ugarit for it has been used in correspondence of the Ugaritic governors or high officers³⁴.

The Ugaritic guardian gods are recalled by a foreigner³⁵; sometimes in collaboration with other gods of the foreign nation:

ilânu^M ša^{mat} ugarit May the gods of Ugarit
ù ilânu^M ša^{mat} amurri and the gods of Amurru
ana šulmani liššuru^{ru}ki protect you (in) health.

(RS 16.111.4-5)³⁶.

Nougayrol comments cogently that the gods of Amurru usually refer to the gods of the writer (Madame Ulmi)³⁷. Thus, the religious conception of the

³² RS 17.83.6-7 (PRU 4: 216); RS 17.143.7-8 (PRU 4: 217); and RS 17.288.5-6 (PRU 4: 215).

³³ Cunchillos (1984: 115-28).

³⁴ Thus, in a letter from Ariteshub, the king of Ushnatu, to the king of Ugarit: RS 17.83.6-7 (PRU 4: 216); RS 17.143.8-9 (PRU 4: 217); in a letter to the governor of Ugarit: RS 17.148 A 5-6 (PRU 6: 9), B 4-5 (PRU 6: 10); in a letter of the King of Amurru to the king of Ugarit: RS 17.152.5 (PRU 4: 214); and, in a letter from the governor of Ugarit: RS 17.239.5-6 (PRU 6: 12). Whilst Cunchillos (1984: 119) refers the phrase to "all the gods" in the pantheon at Ugarit, it is more probable that they are only the lesser deities taking their roles as divine guardians.

³⁵ Cf. RS 15.33.5 (PRU 3: 15): a letter of the Hittian Hishmikushuh to the governor of Ugarit; and RS 16.116.7-8 (PRU 3: 10).

³⁶ It is a letter written by the Amorite Madame Ulmi to the queen of Ugarit; cf. PRU 3: 13. Also, cf. RS 20.200 B 5-6 (Ug 5: 122): a letter written by the prefect of Qadesh to Uzzinu, the prefect of Ugarit. In addition, the personal gods may appear: *ù ilânu^M ša šarri bêlika*, 'and the gods of the king your lord': RS 15.24.5-7 (= RS 15.50.5-7; cf. PRU 3: 18); and *ù gabba ilânu^M ša bît ab[i-ni]*, 'and all the gods of the house of our father': RS 20.178.5-8 (Ug 5: 147-8).

³⁷ Nougayrol (1955: 13): 'Sans doute les dieux d'Amurru sont-ils les dieux de Dame Ulmi' He further remarks interestingly that this may indicate the fact that the queen of

ancient Ugaritians on the function of the guardian deities can be glimpsed here. They are expected to protect the Ugaritians, even other people in other countries in good association with the Ugaritians, and to keep their peace; for this task, their quantity has been regarded as numberless³⁸. The belief that the gods protect the Ugaritians may embrace the idea that they function as warrior deities³⁹.

2.2. Guardian Deities in Mythic Texts

The Ugaritic formula of greeting is found also in the mythic texts; hence, Anat wishes good luck to Shapsh:

<i>an l an y špš</i>	Wherever ⁴⁰ (you go), O Shapsh,
<i>an l an il ygr[k]</i>	wherever (you go) may El protect [you];
<i>tgrk šlm[ilm]</i>	may [the gods] protect you (in) pe[ace] ⁴¹ !

(KTU 1.6 iv 22-4).

It has been suggested that the subjects of the verb *tgrk* are *šlm[w *šhr]*, 'Shalem [and Shahr]'⁴²; in this case, the verbal form is construed as a G. 3. du. However, the DNs usually appear as *šhr w šlm*, as at KTU 1.23.53-54; 1.100.52; 1.107.43; and 1.123.11. Instead, it may be read as *šlm[ilm]*, as attested in the

Ugarit (recipient) was originally an Amorite: 'Cela pourrait indiquer, en tout cas, que la reine d'Ugarit en question était originaire de ce pays'.

³⁸ A motif of the guidance of the numberless angels is found also in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 33.2; Ps 68.18 [ET 17]; and Dan 7.10. etc.

³⁹ Cunchillos (1985b: 76).

⁴⁰ Ug. *an l an* (lit. 'where to where') may be taken here as a relative; thus, 'wherever, anywhere': de Moor (1971: 223-4); Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 264); Gibson (1978: 78); del Olmo (1981: 230); Wyatt (2002: 139); DUL 76 (II). Cf. Heb. *ן*: HALOT 69; Aram. *ן*: DNWSI 79; Ar. *ʿannā*: AEL 119-20. As an interrogative ('where'), see Virolleaud (1931: 218); WUS no. 293; G.R. Driver (1956: 113): 'where (and) whither'. Differently, 'from strength to strength': Margalit (1980: 171, 173); Watson (1983: 158).

⁴¹ CARTU restores the text after Ug. *tgrk* as *š[lm ilm]*, whilst it has been read as *š[]* (CTA), or *šx[]* (KTU¹), or *šlm[]* (KTU²).

⁴² Wyatt (2002: 139-40 n. 101).

Ugaritic or Akkadian epistolary formulas of greeting already described above (cf. *WUS* no. 1811)⁴³.

The divine mountain may be guarded by lesser deities; before they go to fight in the valley between two towns, Anat encounters unidentified lesser deities on a mountain:

w tqry ġlmm b št ġr And she (sc. Anat) met⁴⁴ Lads at the foot of
the mountain

(KTU 1.3 ii 4-5).

Ug. *ġlmm* has been interpreted here as 'servitors'⁴⁵ or 'picked fighters'⁴⁶. Miller supposed them as divine warriors⁴⁷. However, there is no further mention in the texts that they fought Anat as divine warriors. Thus, their main task seems to be to guard the mountain. Nevertheless, they may be regarded as the armed guardians of the mountain⁴⁸: sc. divine warriors.

Summary

The guardian deities are found in the epistles of ancient Ugaritians (KTU 2.13.1-8; 2.16.4-6; 5.9 i 4-6). The personal wish of the divine guidance in the 'epistle' formula corroborates the Ugaritic theological idea of the guardian deities. Both the Akkadian formula and the Ugaritic formula demonstrate the divine guidance of the protector gods (RS 20.17.5; 20.158.5; 21.183.5; 20.255 A 2-3; RS 21.07 C 1-2; and *passim*). Thus, it is concluded that the theological conception of the guardian deities has been widely adopted in ancient

⁴³ De Moor (1971: 223); Margalit (1980: 171-2); de Moor-Spronk (1987: 41); and, also, followed by Wyatt (2002: 139-40 n. 101), proposing an alternative reading as *šlm*[*bn il*].

⁴⁴ Ug. *qry*; to 'meet, encounter': *DUL* 714-5. Cf. Heb. *qrh*: *HALOT* 1137-8; Ar. *qar*: *AEL* 2988.

⁴⁵ G.R. Driver (1956: 85).

⁴⁶ Ginsberg (1969: 136); and Dahood (1972: 135d): 'warrior'.

⁴⁷ Miller (1973: 19).

⁴⁸ Cf. Gen 3:24.

diplomatic epistles. Their guardian role is found also in the Ugaritic mythological texts (KTU 1.6 iv 22-4; 1.3 ii 4-5).

3. Chanter Deities in the Ugaritic Texts

Lesser deities in the Ugaritic pantheon may take their roles as chanters; after El's declaration of the enthronement of his son, Yam Nahar (KTU 1.1 iv 12-5), some divine figures respond to El:

w pʿr šm ym [] And he proclaimed the name of Yam [];
tʿnyn l zntn [] they praised it⁴⁹: 'for our sustenance'⁵⁰ []
at adn tpʿr [] You shall⁵¹ proclaim (him) "Lord"[]'
(KTU 1.1 iv 15-17).

Here the lesser gods who respond to El in their harmony are described as the divine chanters of El in the pantheon. They respect the decision of their master god by chorusing his decree in a voice all together. Other passages adduced in support to their praising function appear also elsewhere:

šbʿd yrgm ʿl ʿd Seven times it shall⁵² be recited upon the
 throne⁵³;
w ʿrbm tʿnyn and the priests⁵⁴ will praise

⁴⁹ The G. 3. m. pl. form, with an energetic suffix, of the Ug. $\sqrt{\text{ny}}$, to 'sing, praise, chorus': *DUL* 173 (II). Cf. Heb. עני: *HALOT* 854; Ar. *ḡanā*: *AEL* 2302-4.

⁵⁰ With a pronominal suffix, Ug. *znt* here denotes 'support, maintenance, sustenance': de Moor (1971: 120); Gibson (1978: 39; or, cf. n. 7: 'for our adornment'); del Olmo (1981: 159); M.S. Smith (1994: 132, 149); *DUL* 1000-1. Cf. Akk. *zinnātu*: *AHW* 1529; *CAD* 21[Z] 123. Differently, 'You shall indeed invest him': Wyatt (2002: 49 and n. 53), construing it as a 2. sg. form, with a *l* emphatic and a 3. pl. obj. suffix, of the $\sqrt{\text{zny}}$, referring to Ar. *zāna*, to 'embellish, adorn'.

⁵¹ Cf. Wyatt (2002: 49).

⁵² Cf. Wyatt (2002: 327).

⁵³ Ug. *ʿd*, 'throne, throne-room': *DUL* 147 (III). Cf. Heb. עדר, עדרים: *HALOT* 787-8, 790-1.

In the context of the divine enthronement, the scribe implies the ritual activities of the human priests of the temple. Their ritual activities may have been reflected in the chanting role of lesser deities in the pantheon. In the story of the birth of the Gracious Gods, the chanters are mentioned again. Thus, the text depicts the following scene:

<i>yṭbn yspr l ḥmš l šlmm</i>	He sat (and) he recited ⁵⁵ (it) five
	times for (their) health;
<i>w yšr pḥr</i>	and the assembly sang ⁵⁶

(KTU 1.23.56-57).

The text has been read variously since Tsumura's suggestion: *yṭb[n] yspr lḥmš lšb[ilʿ]šr pḥr klat*, 'He sits/ (and) counts to five for grow[th to t]en for total completion'⁵⁷. Caquot and Sznycer understand the birth of other gods to be recounted here⁵⁸. Irvin rebuts this view since the Ugaritic texts include 'several instructions to repeat sections'⁵⁹. On the other hand, it may be suggested as the account of El's repeated recitation for the new born gods. In any event, Ug. *pḥr* seems to appear here as the alternative term to Ug. *kbkbm*, the 'Stars' in line 54, who are supposed to receive an offering. Thus it may be

⁵⁴ The pl. form of the Ug. $\sqrt{\text{rb}}$, 'officiant': DUL 181 (II). Cf. Akk. *ērib bīti*: AHw 240; CAD 4[E] 290-2. Cf. 'priest', in a cultic sense: Wyatt (2002: 327). Differently, 'pilgrims': Gaster (1961: 421).

⁵⁵ Ug. *spr*, to 'count, number, recite, write': DUL 766-7. Cf. Heb. ספר: HALOT 765-6; Syr. *spr*: Leslau (1987: 493); Akk. *šapāru*: AHw 1170; CAD 17/1[Š] 430-48.

⁵⁶ Cf. del Olmo (1981: 446).

⁵⁷ Tsumura (1978: 387-8, 391-3), followed by Hetteema (1989-90: 85); Watson (1994a: 8); and Wyatt (2002: 333 and n. 52): 'The periods of pregnancy is described (ten lunar months)'.

⁵⁸ Caquot-Sznycer (1970: 457 nn. 3, 4): "Répétition de la formule des lignes 49-51 pour indiquer que le dieu El possède à nouveau les deux femmes"; "Cette ligne, peu intelligible, semble indiquer qu'on devait répéter la formule précédente pour signifier, peut-être, que le dieu El renouvelait ses copulations, afin d'engendrer la totalité des dieux gracieux, dont malheureusement nous ignorons le nombre".

⁵⁹ Irvin (1978: 81).

implied here that *phr* is portrayed as the celestial beings who perform as the divine chanters to celebrate the birth of the Gracious Gods.

Summary

Chanter deities are identified in the Ugaritic descriptions of the divine enthronement in the pantheon (KTU 1.1 iv 15-17; 1.23.56-57). With their harmony, they respond all together to El. The role of lesser deities as divine chanters is reflected in the rituals of the ancient Ugaritians (cf. KTU 1.23.12).

4. Servant Deities in the Ugaritic Texts

Finally, the lesser deities appear to take a 'servant' role for their master(ess) deities. Thus some Ugaritic terms (*amt*, *'bd* and *ktrm*) used to identify their 'servant' role will be examined in the Ugaritic texts.

4.1. *amt* 'Maidservant'

In KTU 1.12 i two DN's are concerned:

<i>l tlš amt yrḥ</i>	O Talish ⁶⁰ Maidservant ⁶¹ of Yarih ⁶² ;
<i>l dmgy amt aṯrt</i>	O Dimgay ⁶³ Maidservant of Athirat

(KTU 1.12 i 14-7).

The first issue which draw our attention is the problem of the number of deities since each deity apparently belongs to Yarih and Athirat. Yet, it may be interpreted as a female deity, relating to *amt aṯrt*, in KTU 1.4 iv 61, which

⁶⁰ Its etymological root is uncertain. For further discussion of various etymological suggestions of the term, see Caquot-Szzymer (1974: 337 n. s).

⁶¹ Ug. *amt*, '(female) slave, maidservant': Watson (1984:151); DUL 74 (I) Cf. Heb. אַמָּה: HALOT 61; Ph., Pun., ²*mt*; Aram. ²*mh*: DNWSI 70-1; Akk. *amtu*: AHW 45; CAD 1/2[A] 80-5; Ar. ²*ama*: AEL 103.

⁶² Cf. Renfroe (1992: 25): 'Moon-maid'.

⁶³ Its etymological root is questionable as well as Ug. *tlš*. Cf. Caquot-Szzymer (1974: 338 n. u).

occurs as a single deity⁶⁴; thus, its original name is suggested as a binomial name: sc. *tlš w dmg*, 'Talish-and-Dimgay'⁶⁵, which is not attested in other Ugaritic texts. The following Ugaritic terms may support the identity as singular: *at*, as a 2. f. sg. pron. (KTU 1.12 i 14); *-k*, as a 2. f. sg. suffix to the nouns (*ksank*, *ḥdgk*, *ḥtlk*: KTU 1.12 i 18-19) and to the verb (*tbrkk*, KTU 1.12 i 26).

This female deity may probably be identified as the lesser deity (*amt*) serving both Yarih and Athirat. Now she is serving El, who commands her to take her clothes and belongings (sc. 'obstetrical paraphernalia'⁶⁶) and go forth into the desert (KTU 1.12 i 17-22).

In other texts, Ug. *amt* is used to indicate a lesser deity: *hm amt atrt tlbnt lbnt*, 'Or (am I) a maidservant of Athirat to make bricks?' (KTU 1.4 iv 61-2). The *amt atrt* is mentioned here to signify a divine labourer. With this point, it may be related to *dmg amt atrt* which is described as labouring in KTU 1.2 i 22-26; she is charged by El to dig in the soil.

4.2. 'bd 'Servant'

The function of Ug. 'bd, which denotes 'servant deities' in the Ugaritic texts, has been discussed already⁶⁷. It is used, paralleled with Ug. 'nn as well as *amt*, in order to indicate an assistant deity of Athirat (cf. KTU 1.4 iv 59 - v 1).

4.3. *ktrm* 'Skilful Ones'

Appearing at KTU 1.2, the lesser gods are supposed to serve the higher deity; the god Athtar expects that he will be served by the assistant gods of Yam:

trḥšn ktrm Skilful Ones⁶⁸ will wash me⁶⁹,

⁶⁴ Caquot-Sznycer (1974: 338 n. c).

⁶⁵ Renfroe (1992: 25).

⁶⁶ Renfroe (1992: 25).

⁶⁷ Cf. 'Divine 'Labourer' in Part I of Chapter III.

[yt]b b [bt zbl]ym [dwell]ing in [the house of Prince] Yam,
b hkl tpt nh[r] in the palace of Judge Naha[r]!

(KTU 1.2 iii 20-21).

The text seems to describe Athtar's funeral allegorically through his own address. The context informs us that Athtar would be dead if his throne is transferred to Yam by El and he loses his throne (cf. KTU 1.2 iii 15-24). Then the Skilful Ones here are mentioned to occur in order to take a role as the undertaker gods to wash the dead body for burial⁷⁰.

4.4. Radaman

The servant god of Baal, Radaman, appears in KTU 1.3 i 2-22, where his name occurs only once:

<i>prdmn 'bd ali[yn] b'ḳ</i>	Radaman served Mightiest Baal,
<i>sid zbl b'ḳ arš</i>	waiting on the Prince, Lord of Earth,
<i>qm yḷr w yšlḥmnh</i>	arising and serving;
<i>ybrd td</i>	he gave him to eat

(KTU 1.3 i 2-6).

Whilst some read the first term in line 2 as *prdmn*⁷¹, relating it to a Hurrian PN, in a *-men(n)i* ending⁷², others take it without *p-*, construing it as a copula⁷³.

⁶⁸ The pl. form of Ug. *ktr*, 'skilful': DUL 471 (I). Cf. Heb. כְּשִׁיר: HALOT 503; Aram. *kšr*: DNWSI 539-40; Akk. *kašāru*: AHw 461-2; CAD 8[K] 284-5. Differently, 'servant': van Selms (1979: 742).

⁶⁹ A 3. m. pl. form, with a 1. sg. pronominal suffix, of the Ug. *√rḥš*, to 'wash': DUL 738. Cf. רָחַץ: HALOT 1220-1; Aram. *rḥṣ*: DNWSI 1072; Akk. *raḥāṣu*: AHw 942-3; CAD [R] 72-4; Ar. *raḥaḍa*: AEL 1052.

⁷⁰ Wyatt (2002: 55 n. 81) remarks cogently that "The *ktrt* deal with affairs of conception and birth (KTU 1.17 ii 26-42; 1.24); it appears that male counterparts, *ktrm*, deal with death and its ritualization".

⁷¹ It has been taken as a proper noun: Aistleitner (1964: 24); Rin (1968: 73).

⁷² Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 153 and n. c). Cf. Gröndahl (1967: 240).

⁷³ Wyatt (2002: 70 n. 1). Cf. UT §19.1991; WUS no. 2178. Gibson (1978: 46 n. 1) refers a reading as *rdmn* to Akk. PN *Radmānu*. Cf. Tallqvist (1938: 185).

As a DN, Ug. *rdmn* has been connected to the Gk. Radamanthys⁷⁴. In any event, Radaman occurs as a servant deity of Baal⁷⁵. Thus the text portrays his lesser status as the divine servant (KTU 1.3 i 2-22).

Summary

Ugaritic servant deities are expressed in various divine titles in the Ugaritic Texts: *amt* (KTU 1.12 i 14-7; 1.4 iv 61); *‘bd* (KTU 1.4 iv 59 - v 1); or *ktrm* (KTU 1.2 iii 20-21). Among them some servant deities are known by their own names. The single deity *tlš dmgy*, probably ‘Talish(-and-)Dimgay’, appears as the maidservant of Yarih and Athirat (KTU 1.12 i 14-7). The *rdmn*, ‘Radaman’, occurs as the servant god of Baal (KTU 1.3 i 2-22).

Conclusion to Chapter V, Part I

The Ugaritic texts illustrate the various roles of lesser deities: divine mediators, guardians, chanters, or servants. The lesser deities indicated by *ilm* or *bn qdš* occur as the mediator deities between the higher gods and humans (KTU 1.19 iv 22-25, 29-31). The guardian deities are remarked in the epistles (KTU 2.13.1-8; 2.16.4-6; 5.9 i 4-6) for the personal wish of the divine guidance. They are also expressed in the Akkadian epistolary formula (RS 20.17.5; 20.158.5; 21.183.5; 20.255 A 2-3; RS 21.07 C 1-2; and *passim*) as well as in the Ugaritic mythological texts (KTU 1.6 iv 22-4; 1.3 ii 4-5). The chanter deities perform their role in the divine enthronement in the pantheon (KTU 1.1 iv 15-17; 1.23.56-57). The servant deities are entitled as *amt* (KTU 1.12 i 14-7; 1.4 iv 61), *‘bd* (KTU 1.4 iv 59 - v 1), or *ktrm* (KTU 1.2 iii 20-21). Among them there appear named deities such as *tlš, dmgy*, the maidservants of Yarih

⁷⁴ De Moor (1987: 2 n. 9).

⁷⁵ Caquot-Szyncer (1974: 153 and n. c); Gibson (1978: 46 n. 1); a ‘minor deity not mentioned elsewhere’; and, also, Wyatt (2002: 70 n. 1): ‘He appears to be a minor deity here’. For further discussion on *rdmn*, see Astour (1998: 55-89).

and Athirat (KTU 1.12 i 14-7), and *rdmn*, the servant god of Baal (KTU 1.3 i 2-22).

In this part we will look at lesser deities other than the divine messengers and warriors in the Hebrew Bible: sc. divine mediators, guardians, chanters, and servants⁷⁶. Some biblical Hebrew texts relevant to the subject will be examined for the research.

1. Mediator Deities in the Hebrew Bible

Some biblical Hebrew texts present the role of lesser deities as divine mediators for humans.

1.1. Job 16.19-21

In Job 16.19-21 a divine being is affirmed to plead with Yahweh as a mediator on behalf of Job:

הנה בשמים עדי	Behold, in heaven (is) my witness ⁷⁷ ;
ושהדי במרומים	and my advocate ⁷⁸ (is) on the heights

(v. 19).

The ער and שהר occur here to be paralleled with the same denotation⁷⁹. These two titles may be better understood in a judicial context of the divine court. Thus they designate an official role of a divine 'defender' or 'mediator' in the divine court.

⁷⁶ Roles of lesser deities described in the Ugaritic texts are very similar to those in the Hebrew Bible. This study will survey the diverse roles of lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible to compare with those instanced in the Ugaritic texts in Part I of this chapter.

⁷⁷ Heb. ער, 'throne, witness, someone who is witness to a fact or to an event, and who is able to confirm it in case of doubt': BDB 729; HALOT 787-9. Cf. Ug. 'd: UT §19.1817; DUL 147 (III).

⁷⁸ Heb. שהר, 'witness', derived from Aram. *šhd*: BDB 962; HALOT 1311. Cf. 'advocate': NASB; NIV; 'guarantor': Pope (1973: 122, 125).

⁷⁹ Habel (1985: 265).

Against this view that the 'mediator' is a divine figure other than Yahweh, it is argued that this mediator is Yahweh himself⁸⁰. However, the context offers a clue that these titles refer to a divine figure other than Yahweh. The following text explains the bicolon:

ויוֹכַח לְגֹבֵר עִם אֱלֹהִים וּבֶן אָדָם לְרֵעֵהוּ

Let him mediate for a man with God (as) that of a son of man
for his fellow

(v. 21).

Heb. מְלִיצִי, 'my mediator'⁸¹, in v. 20 is construed as a sg. form, as indicating a divine being⁸², whereas it has been read as a pl., identified as Job's friends⁸³. Yet the מְלִיצִי in v. 20 is referred to as the same single mediator explained in vv. 19 and 21⁸⁴. The celestial being in v. 21 functions as the divine mediator on behalf of humans before Yahweh. The 'mediator' role is certainly one of the main roles of divine messengers (cf. Tob 12.15).

Tur-Sinai insists that שֹׁהַד/עֵד in v. 19 is not employed in the 'sense of a favourable witness', rather, it indicates a divine accuser who 'testifies against' Job⁸⁵. Yet, his function as the defender on behalf of Job at the heavenly court is clarified in the following vv. 20-21.

⁸⁰ Rejecting the interpretations of Mowinckel, Irwin, Pope, and Terrien, Rowley (1970: 150) claims that he is 'God' rather than a 'second heavenly figure'. Also, Hartley (1988: 264).

⁸¹ Heb. מְלִיצִי has been construed as a H. ptc. m. sg. form of the מְלִיצִי, to 'scorn'; and it is interpreted with a figurative sense as 'intermediaries between God and man' (BDB 539). It also refers to Ph. *mlš*, 'interpreter', derived from the מְלִיצִי (DNWSI 575-6). Hence, 'interpreter; envoy; subordinate; heavenly being, interceding angel' (HALOT 590); and 'mediator' (DCH 300; and other major translations: NASB, NIV, NJB, NKJV, and NRSV). Thus, it is a divine title for a specific office: Canney (1923-4: 135-7).

⁸² Pope (1973: 125-6); Habel (1985: 263, 265-6).

⁸³ Rowley (1970: 150-1) reads מְלִיצִי רַעִי in v. 20 as "my scorers (*m^elīṣay*) are my friends". Also, see Gordis (1978: 179).

⁸⁴ For further discussion, see Habel (1985: 265-6).

⁸⁵ Tur-Sinai (1957: 269).

1.2. Job 33.23-4

In the text a divine messenger⁸⁶ is described as a mediator (מֵלֵאךְ מְלִיץ) or advocate for the accused in the trial of the assembly of Yahweh (See Job 16.20; and cf. Zech 3.1-5):

v. 23 אִם יֵשׁ עָלָיו מֵלֵאךְ מְלִיץ אֶחָד מִנִּי אֱלֹף לְהַגִּיד לָאָדָם יִשְׁרֹו

If there be for him a 'mediator' messenger⁸⁷, one of a thousand (messengers), to declare to man his uprightness.

v. 24 וַיַּחַנְנוּ וַיֹּאמֶר פִּדְעָהּ מִרְדָּת שַׁחַת מִצַּאֲתֵי כְפֹר

Then he (sc. Yahweh)⁸⁸ is gracious (to) him, and says "Deliver him from going down (to) a pit, I have obtained a ransom".

From the phrase מֵלֵאךְ מְלִיץ אֶחָד מִנִּי אֱלֹף, 'one of a thousand', the אֱלֹף is recognised as the heavenly council⁸⁹; hence, it may be read as 'one of a thousand messengers', although other Hebrew references specify their number to be more than that (Deut 33.2-3; Ps 68.16-8; and Dan 7.10). Thus this figure is regarded as the special divine messenger among other ordinary divine messengers⁹⁰.

⁸⁶ Rowley's (1970: 273) suggestion of מֵלֵאךְ as human is improbable in the context. The text contains a background of the heavenly court: cf. Job 16.19-21. Hartley (1988: 446) takes a position to see him as a divine messenger. For further discussion of the identity of this messenger, see Hartley (1988: 446-7).

⁸⁷ Lit. 'a messenger (as) a mediator'.

⁸⁸ Rowley (1970: 274) interprets this figure unconvincingly as an "angel". It is rather explicated as the judge at the divine court.

⁸⁹ P.L. Day (1988: 42). S.R. Driver (1908: 231) points out that the phrase מֵלֵאךְ מְלִיץ אֶחָד מִנִּי אֱלֹף does not indicate "any superlative position to this angel; he is one of the thousand (cf. Rev. v. 11) ministering spirits sent forth to do service on behalf of the heirs of salvation (Heb. i. 14)"; also Habel (1985: 470). Cf. Eccl 7.28.

⁹⁰ Hartley (1988: 447).

The ransom is satisfactory to redeem the accused. What the ransom means would be another discussible issue⁹¹. Thus, the role of the messenger in the celestial court may be extended further to the 'redeemer' (also found at Ps 34.7-8 [ET 6-7]). At any rate his role appears to be to plead with Yahweh for the accused. The 'mediator' role of the divine agent can be glimpsed again in Job 5.1:

קרא נא	Call now!
היש עונך	Is there anyone who will answer you?
ואל מי מקדשים תפנה	And to which one among the Holy Ones will you turn?

עבדים occurs here as a divine title⁹², which can be compared with מלאכים, 'servants', מלאכים, 'messengers' (Job 4.18), and אלף, 'a thousand (messengers)' (Job 33.23)⁹³. The prototype of this 'mediator' role in Job may be suggested in the Ugaritic texts: Danel serves lesser deities in order to have them perform as mediator deities between him and higher gods (KTU 1.17 i 1-15a); as a result, Baal appears as the mediator on behalf of Danel before El (KTU 1.17 i 15b ff.).

Summary

The motif of the mediator deities, found in the Ugaritic texts, is attested also in the Hebrew Bible. Hence, some biblical Hebrew descriptions refer to the role of the divine beings as those who would plead with Yahweh on behalf of

⁹¹ The ransom is not specified in the text. For various opinions of it, cf. Habel (1985: 470). Rowley (1970: 274) points out a ransom should be "provided by the mediator as the expression of his graciousness, after reclaiming the sufferer, to buy him an extension of life".

⁹² A.B. Davidson (1889: 35); Tur-Siani (1957: 92); Rowley (1970: 57); Habel (1985: 130). For occurrences of קדשים as the divine title elsewhere, cf. Exod 15.11; Deut 33.2-3; Job 15.15; and Ps 16.3, 34; 29.2; 68.18; 89.6, 8, 36; and 110.3 (LXX), etc.

⁹³ Habel (1985: 130-1) remarks that the "role of heavenly intermediaries in the governance of the cosmos persists as a major theme in Job from the moment the council of heaven meets in the opening legend" (Job 1.6).

a human: the divine titles, עַד, שֹׁהַד, and מַלְאֲךְ מְלִיץ are used particularly to represent the mediator deity, which suppose the judicial context of the divine court (Job 16.19-21); this figure, distinguished as one of a thousand lesser deities, should be the special divine messenger executing as the redeemer (Job 33.23-4). The ‘mediator’ role of the lesser deity is also found in Job 5.1.

2. Guardian Deities in the Hebrew Bible

The role of lesser deities as divine guardians, as suggested in Deut 32.8-9, is found frequently in the Hebrew Bible. It may convey the significant theological meaning of guardian deities in regard to the political situations of the Israelites, as in Exod 23.20-23, etc.

2.1. Genesis 32.2-3

The narrative presents the fact that the מַלְאֲכִים can be recognised as guardian deities as well as warrior deities since Jacob meets them whilst wishing for his own safety on his journey (cf. Gen 24.7; 28.11-5)⁹⁴. The text reads:

v. 2	ויעקב הלך לדרכו	And Jacob went on his way;
	ויפגשו בו מלאכי אלהים	and the messengers of God encountered him ⁹⁵ ;

⁹⁴ The theophany of the מַלְאֲךְ represents Yahweh’s reassurance of his divine protection for Jacob on his return: Westermann (1984-6: [2] 505).

⁹⁵ Heb. פָּגַע, to ‘meet, encounter’: BDB 803; HALOT 910. It is suggested that Heb. פָּגַע is used intentionally with the preposition בַּ in order to indicate a physical contact between the divine agents and Jacob: Speiser (1964: 254 n. 2). It is posited that מַחֲנֶה in v. 3 and פָּגַע in v. 2 indicate a ‘warlike encounter’: Skinner (1910: 405). LXX reads, εἶδεν παρεμβολὴν θεοῦ παρεμβεβληκυῖαν καὶ συνήντησαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, ‘he saw the host of God encamped and the messengers of God met him’.

We read that when Jacob encountered the messengers of Yahweh (cf. Gen 28.12), they were regarded as the warrior deities so that the place was called מחנים, which literally means 'two camps'⁹⁶. Thus, it may allude to the two groups of the צבא השמים, the 'host of the heavens' (cf. 1 Kgs 22.19-22). Westermann points out that the מחנה in v. 3 is a military term which connotes a plural number of the divine warriors⁹⁷. Although they appear as divine warriors, it is obvious that they function also as divine guardians for the safe journey of Jacob⁹⁸.

2.2. Psalm 91.11-2

Psalm 91 offers a description of a group of divine messengers (מלאכים) who protect humans as their guardian deity, as described in Gen 32.2-3 above (cf. Exod 23.20; Josh 5.13-5; and Ps 34.8 [ET 7]). They secure a traveller who trusts in Yahweh from any physical harm. Thus the text runs:

כי מלאכיו יצוה לך לשמרך בכל דרכיך
על כפים ישאונך פן תגף באבן רגלך

⁹⁶ BDB 334; S.R. Driver (1909: 291 and n. 1).

⁹⁷ Westermann (1984-6: [2] 505): "God's angels confront him in a great host (stressed in 1 Chron. 12:22) which makes him think of a 'company of God'".

⁹⁸ Brueggemann (1982: 262).

For he will charge⁹⁹ his messengers concerning you to protect you in all your ways¹⁰⁰. On (their) hands, they will carry you lest you strike your foot against a stone.

The idea of divine protection is found here, as it is found in the Ugaritic texts (KTU 1.6 iv 22-4)¹⁰¹. The group of messenger deities as divine guardians may signify the powerful divine guidance of Yahweh. In addition, Yahweh also sends a single messenger in advance (cf. Ps 34.8, which may be related to the description in Gen 48.16¹⁰²). Hence the messenger of Yahweh (מלאך יהוה) accompanies humans on the road to protect them for their safety (Gen 24.7, 40; Exod 14.19; 23.20, 23; 32.34; 33.2; Ps 34.8 [ET 34.7]; and Tob 5.21).

2.3. Exodus 23.20-23

This text is one of the most recondite passages in regard to the role of the divine messenger inasmuch as various aspects of the angelic function appear.

The text runs:

v. 20 הנה אנכי שלח מלאך לפניך לשמרך בדרך
ולהביאך אל המקום אשר הכנתי

See, I am sending a messenger before your face to protect you in the way and to bring¹⁰³ you into the place¹⁰⁴ which I have prepared.

⁹⁹ It may be taken in a sense of 'to send': Dahood (1966-70: [2] 333, also cf. [1] 259).

¹⁰⁰ Dahood's (1966-70: [2] 328) reading of the phrase as 'in all your marches' in a military sense is not plausible.

¹⁰¹ The text reads *an l an y špš an l an il ygr[k] tgrk šlm[ilm]*, 'Wherever (you go), O Shapsh, wherever (you go) may El protect [you]; may [the gods] protect you (in) pe[ace]!'. For the textual analysis, see above.

¹⁰² The text reads *המלאך הנאל אחי מכל רע יברך את הנערים*, 'The messenger who is redeeming me from all evil bless the lads'. Cf. SP, which alters 'angel' to 'king'.

¹⁰³ The hiphil form of the *בוא* may indicate the fact that Yahweh tells the messenger to guard the Israelites.

¹⁰⁴ The *מקום* apparently refers to the land of Canaan. Due to its frequent meaning of "sacred place", the designation of the land possibly carries the idea of the Holy Land with it.

אל תמר בו כי לא ישא לפשעכם כי שמי בקרב

Watch his face and listen to his voice; do not cause bitterness against him, for he will not bear with your transgression, since my name (is) in the midst of him.

כי אם שמע חשמע בקלו ועשית כל אשר אדבר

ואיבתי את איביך

וצרתי את צרריך

But if you listen (and) listen¹⁰⁵ to his voice and do all that I say, then I will be hostile (to) your enemies and I will bind those who bind you.

כי ילך מלאכי לפניך

והביאך אל האמרי והחתי והפרזי והכנעני החוי והיבوسی

והכחדתי

For my messenger will go before your face and bring you to the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites and the Jebusites; and I will destroy them¹⁰⁶.

The divine messenger plays here multiple roles in regard to the holy war of the Israelites: 'guardian', 'messenger', and 'forgiver'.

2.3.1. Messenger as the Divine Guardian: the Dual Role

The text begins with the divine oath of sending a מלאך, 'messenger', for the safety of the Israelites to proceed toward the Promised Land (Num 20.16; Exod 14.19); that is to say, Yahweh's divine protection of the Israelites operates through the agency of the מלאך of Yahweh himself. The מלאך bears

¹⁰⁵ Or, 'indeed listen'. The infinitive absolute frequently follows after אם as the indication of the protasis, a conditional sentence. In this case it emphasises the importance of the consequent condition. See Kautzsch (1910: §113; 3.o).

¹⁰⁶ Lit. 'him'. The ending of the term is a 3. masc. sg. suffix of the כחד.

his role as the divine 'guardian' as well as the divine 'messenger' (cf. Gen 48.16). Thus, the messenger implements his role to protect the Israelites for their victory over their enemies in the holy war.

2.3.2. Messenger as the Divine Agent of Yahweh

Yahweh's promise of sending (שלח) the guardian deity stated in v. 20 is later recapitulated in Exod 32.34 and 33.2. The participial form of the verbal root שלח poses a riddle as to whether this figure is the messenger now present with the Israelites as shown in Exod 14.19 or if he represents the promised divine saviour, who was to come. Yet the messengers mentioned in the two texts seem to be the same divine figure in that they represent the presence of Yahweh. Thus, the same messenger who led the Israelites out of Egypt may be described: Exod 14.19; 23.20; 32.34; 33.2; Num 20.16; and Isa 63.9 (cf. Mal 3.1).

The divine messenger who will lead the Israelites to the Promised Land may be identified also with the divine messenger who appears at Horeb (Exod 3.2) because what appeared there represented the theophanic presence of Yahweh. The messenger refers to an extension of Yahweh's presence because he comes with divine authority¹⁰⁷.

It has been said that in the text Yahweh and his messenger are identified as one; thus, the unity of Yahweh and his messenger¹⁰⁸. This view may be argued for two reasons. First, the third and first persons are alternately used in the passages: 'if you listen (and) listen to his voice and do all that I say' (v. 22); 'my messenger will go before your faces ... and I will destroy them' (v. 23). It is argued also that in this verse the messenger's

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Durham (1987: 335).

¹⁰⁸ S.R. Driver (1911: 247-8); Cassuto (1967: 305-7); Niehaus (1995: 191, 192 and n. 18). Cf. Exod 15.26; 19.5: 'obey his voice'; Num 20.24; and Ps 78.40: 'do not be rebellious toward him'.

speech is identical with Yahweh's¹⁰⁹. Secondly, the messenger has authority to pardon or not to pardon transgression: 'do not make bitter against him, for he will not bear with your transgression' (v. 21).

However, the divine messenger is more likely to be regarded as a lesser deity than Yahweh himself¹¹⁰. This can be explained on three counts. First, the entire content of the messenger's speech is to be construed as the sender's message, merely uttered through his messenger *verbatim*, as already discussed in Chapter III. Hence, the messenger's message becomes the sender's message. Thus, it is an obligation for the Israelites to obey the message of the messenger who is the direct representative of the sender.

Secondly, the messenger appears as a symbolic entity for the Israelites to obey, to assure their victory over their enemies in the holy war (v. 22). Thus, the messenger may become the sign of the covenant by which Yahweh binds himself in order to guarantee the security of the Israelites.

Yahweh's requirement of Israelite obeisance to the messenger consists of the series of blessings and curses (cf. Deut 27-30; Lev 26). The conditional blessings and adversities in the text evoke the similar metaphors of ancient Near Eastern law codes and covenants¹¹¹. The formula used here has some similarity to the conditional sentences found in OB laws, especially in the 'Laws of Hammurapi'¹¹². Hence, it consists of two sets of clauses in OB laws¹¹³: the protasis, a conditional clause, and apodosis: thus, 'If such and such (has) occurred, this and that will/should be done'¹¹⁴. On the other hand, the statement in the text has been recognised as similar to the languages of

¹⁰⁹ Cf. S.R. Driver (1911: 248).

¹¹⁰ Clements (1972: 155).

¹¹¹ Sarna (1991: 147).

¹¹² Cassuto (1967: 305); Hyatt (1980: 251). For a short notice of the Laws of Hammurapi, cf. Huehnergard (2000: 160-1).

¹¹³ Huehnergard (2000: 157, 171-2).

¹¹⁴ Cf. 'Akkadian Omen Texts' in Huehnergard (2000: 224-5).

treaties; a parallel formula is found especially in the vassal-treaties¹¹⁵. In any event, obedience to this divine agent becomes a condition for the contract between Yahweh and the Israelites to succeed.

Thirdly, the *הכחדתי* in v. 23 occurs as a hiphil form, construed as a causative verb. It may be understood that Yahweh causes (the *messenger*) to destroy the enemies of the Israelites. Thus, it is explained possibly as an activity of the *messenger* caused by Yahweh. It may be confirmed in the MT of Isa 63.9 that Yahweh let the messenger save the Israelites from Egypt:

ומלאך פניו הושיעם And he caused the messenger, His Face¹¹⁶,
to deliver them.

These features support the view that he is the special agent who represents the presence of Yahweh.

2.3.3. Messenger as the Divine Forgiver

The messenger is described in the text as having considerable authority in using his power, even to take away the transgression of the Israelites; he is highly accredited to do so for he has the name of the sender (v. 21)¹¹⁷.

This significant feature of the 'messenger' activity raises the theological question of whether or not the divine messenger has the power to forgive the transgressions of humans. The answer may be obtained from Isa 6.7, which describes the actions of a lesser deity, one of the *שרפים*¹¹⁸, who

¹¹⁵ Cf. Fensham (1963b: esp., 138-40, 141-2). An example of similar sentiments can be seen in the peace treaty made between the Hittite Hattusilis and the Egyptian Ramses II, as well as in a Northwest Semitic treaty: ANET 200-12.

¹¹⁶ *פניו* may be understood here as the title of the messenger, as the representative of Yahweh.

¹¹⁷ Clements (1972: 155) interprets that "God's name given to his messenger implied that the direct personal authority of God rested in him".

¹¹⁸ Its root *שרף* means 'to burn'. When the lesser deity appears in the theophanic form of light (*שרפים*), which signifies the presence of Yahweh, he may have considerable authority. Cf. 'Messenger Theophany' in Chapter III.

touched Isaiah's mouth with a burning coal and said 'your iniquity is turned aside, and your sin is covered'¹¹⁹.

Thus, it may be suggested that the divine messenger may function to forgive the sin of humans, which usually only Yahweh can do (cf. Mark 2:7), when Yahweh's presence and authority are given to him with his name. In doing so the divine messenger manifests and demonstrates the very person of Yahweh. In this regard, this anonymous messenger in Exod 23 is tied very closely with the sender's presence.

The descriptions of the divine messenger in Exod 23 clarify the fact that the messenger is not Yahweh himself, but the special agent of Yahweh, and that the messenger is distinguished from other ordinary messenger deities elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible and from those of other ancient Near Eastern texts in regard to his multiple roles and functions.

2.4. Cherubim

The כְּרוּבִים, 'Cherubim', may be related etymologically to Akk. *kāribu*, a designation of 'a person performing a specific religious act' or 'a deity represented as making a gesture of adoration'¹²⁰, or Akk. *kuribu*, a 'representation of a protective genius with specific non-human features'¹²¹. The second term may indicate a colossus of a protective spirit placed at the Mesopotamian temple gate (i.e. winged human-headed horses or bulls).

¹¹⁹ The text reads סָר עוֹנֶיךָ וְחַטֹּאתֶיךָ תִּכְפֹּר.

¹²⁰ *AHw* 449; *CAD* 8[K] 216-7. Hence, it may be related to Akk. *karābu*, 'prayer, blessing' (*CAD* 8[K] 192; Mettinger, 1999a: 190), which is connected closely to the liturgical function; cf. its verbal usage (*ibid.*: 192-8). For further discussion of the etymology of the term, cf. Freedman-O'Connor (1995: 308-10).

¹²¹ *AHw* 510; *CAD* 8[K] 559. Cf. Wyatt (2001: 244 n. 8).

Although its Ugaritic cognate *krb* is not attested in the Ugaritic texts¹²², an indicator of a similar function of the biblical Cherubim may be suggested in KTU 1.16 i 1-3:

k klb b btk nʿtq Like a dog that has grown old¹²³ at your house¹²⁴,

k inr ap ḥšt like a dog¹²⁵ (that has grown old at) the entrance of your burial chamber¹²⁶

(KTU 1.16 i 2-3).

Gray commented that dogs are only allowed to be in houses due to sufferance in the ancient Semitic world¹²⁷. Pope argued that dogs are related to death¹²⁸. Niehr, citing Hittite parallels, has claimed that the bicolon from *Keret* is an allusion to the abandonment of puppies in a pit adjacent to the

¹²² Del Olmo (1984b: 130 n. 292); Cooper (1988: 20); Freedman-O'Connor (1995: 310). The reading *bkrb* in KTU 1.3 i 12 is corrected as *bk.rb*, a 'large cup'. Freedman-O'Connor (*ibid.*) mention that the reading of *k klb b* as *k krb b*, in KTU 1.16 i 2, is not proved. It is also suggested that it occurs as the first reading at KTU 1.19 i 2; thus, it is read []*kr(?)b* (Virolleaud, 1936: 125); [t]*krb* (CTA); *tkrb* (KTU¹and2); *tkrb* (CARTU 111); and *tkrb* (Margalit, 1989a: 131). However, because of the uncertainty of the letters (indicated in italics and romans) and the paralleled term *tql*, it is better understood as the *trd* ($\sqrt{\text{yrd}}$) as suggested by G.R. Driver (1956: 58) and followed by Gibson (1978: 113) and Wyatt (2002: 288 n. 167), saying that the last letter is read as *d* rather than *b*. Therefore, the text is taken as *trd* ... *tql*, '... came down ... fell ...'.

¹²³ The translation of the verb has been taken either as to 'pass' (Gibson, 1978: 94; de Moor, 1987: 211) or to 'age' (del Olmo, 1981: 309). It may be construed as a N. form of the Ug. $\sqrt{\text{tq}}$, to 'pass'; thus, to 'become old, age': DUL 191-2. Differently, 'shall we howl': Wyatt (2002: 219 and n. 194).

¹²⁴ Citing Pope (1972), Wyatt (2002: 219 and n. 195) suggests interestingly that it may refer, as a secondary sense, to 'tomb' (sc. Keret's tomb) for dogs are 'frequently associated with death' in ancient Semitic world.

¹²⁵ Ug. *inr*, 'dog': DUL 83. Cf. 'whelps': Wyatt (2002: 219); 'puppies': de Moor (1987: 211). Differently, 'temple servitors': Gray (1964a: 22, 64).

¹²⁶ Ug. *ḥšt*, 'sepulchre, mausoleum': DUL 412; 'burial chamber': Wyatt (2002: 219 and n. 196). Cf. Akk. *ḥaštu*: AHw 334; CAD 6[Ḫ] 143. Cf. 'basement': de Moor (1987: 211).

¹²⁷ Gray (1964a: 64).

¹²⁸ Pope (1972: esp., 183-9); followed by Wyatt (2002: 219 n. 195).

royal tomb at Ugarit¹²⁹. In any event, the *klb/inr* at the tomb may be interpreted most probably as divine guardians like sphinxes at the sacred place or tomb¹³⁰.

Whilst various opinions on the origin of the כרובים have been proposed¹³¹, they may be related to the sphinx. Hence, some have linked them to the Mesopotamian winged sphinx¹³². However, the sphinx is found widely from Egypt to Mesopotamia and from Anatolia to Greece, and its representations are various. Albright argues their relation with a Canaanite mythological pattern; thus, the כרובים are the 'winged sphinx or winged lion with human head', which is found frequently in 'art and religious symbolism' in the Syrio-Palestine area¹³³. Meanwhile, they are related to the

¹²⁹ See Cornelius-Niehr (2004).

¹³⁰ See sphinxes in Ugaritic cylinder seals: at the cylinder num. R.S. 11.025 (in Schaeffer-Forrer, 1983: 42); R.S. 23.001 (*ibid.*: 49-50); Enkomi-Alasia 13.093 (*ibid.*: 57); Chypre A12 (*ibid.*: 63-4); Chypre A17 (*ibid.*: 65); Chypre A18 (*ibid.*: 66); Chypre A19 (*ibid.*: 66-7); Appendice 2 (*ibid.*: 69-70).

¹³¹ It has been argued that the image of the כרובים may be derived from the Mesopotamian mythological background: Dhorme-Vincent (1926: 340); Colunga (1941: 153); Haran (1978: 259). It has been said that they are related to the Assyrian lion and bull statues: Dhorme-Vincent (*ibid.*: 486); and their eagle's head (Ezek 1.10; 10.14) has been explained from the Assyrian Cherub, which takes an image of a bird: Colunga (*ibid.*: 130-4). Differently, it has been argued that their image may be derived from the Syro-Hittite idea which depicts these guardian deities of the godhead: Wulff (1894: 3). For further discussion of extra-biblical evidence of the cherubim in monumental colossi in ancient Near East, cf. Freedman-O'Connor (1995: 314-8).

¹³² Perrot-Chippiez (1882-1914: [4] 305, 331); and Vogt (1979).

¹³³ Albright (1938a); followed by G.E. Wright (1941: 28), who relates to Canaanite (Phoenician) mythological motif (G.E. Wright, 1962: 95, 142). As a possible link to the biblical Cherubim, the Canaanite winged sphinx found in Nimrud, Khorsabad, Arslan-Tash, Samaria, Megiddo, and other Syrio-Palestine places may be suggested. However, the cognate root *krb*, indicating a 'guardian deity', is not found either in Phoenician texts or in the Ugaritic texts: Haran (1978: 259 n. 20). Mettinger (1999a: 190) argues the throne with the sphinxes is innovated from Syria for "while the Egyptian lion-paws throne never carried a god, the Syrian sphinx throne was used for both gods and kings".

Egyptian sphinx¹³⁴; Pudor identifies the Egyptian sphinx with the Babylonian Cherub whose image is taken in the biblical Cherub¹³⁵; and Wyatt relates the כרובים to the Egyptian 'leonine' sphinx and to the Mesopotamian winged 'leonine or bovine' sphinx, which is found commonly as divine guardians at the temple gate or some other places (the lion-gates of Mycenae and Hattusas)¹³⁶.

In any event these suggestions from etymological evidence and from the image of the winged sphinx at the sacred place may support the fact that the Cherubim function as guardian deities or as servant deities¹³⁷.

2.4.1. Cherubim as Guardian Deities

The כרובים represent a 'potent figure, symbolic of protection, a sort of sacred guardian of holy things'¹³⁸. Gen 3.24 illustrates that the Cherubim are manifested as the divine guardians of the sacred place (cf. Ezek 28.14, 16); hence, they protect the tree of life in the garden in order to prevent banned humans from approaching it (cf. 1 Kgs 6.29-35; Ezek 41.18-25); and the whirling fiery sword has been placed there; thus, the text describes:

¹³⁴ Gressmann (1920: 9-11, 70-2).

¹³⁵ Pudor (1905: 7).

¹³⁶ Wyatt (2001: 244 n. 8; cf. 237 n. 1).

¹³⁷ Metzger (1985: 326) credibly mentions that the biblical Cherub is the parity with the sphinx, which takes a guardian role and a servant role at the throne of gods in Syrio-Palestine representations. Cf. "Ein Vergleich der Aussagen des Alten Testaments über das Aussehen und die Funktionen von Keruben mit dem Aussehen und den Funktionen von Mischwesen in der Bildtradition des Alten Orients ergab, dass der Kerub wahrscheinlich mit der geflügelten Sphinx zu identifizieren ist, da die Sphinx das syrisch-palästinensischen Bilddokumenten am häufigsten bezeugte Mischwesen ist, das, wie der Kereb, häufig in Wächterfunktion erscheint und häufig Bestandteil von Götterthronen ist" (*ibid.*: 365). Mettinger (1999a: 190-2) suggests the function of the cherubim as two: "as guardians of a sacred tree or as guardians and carriers of a throne".

¹³⁸ Barnett (1977: 46).

וישכן מקדם לגן עדן את הכרובים ואת להט החרב המתהפכת

לשמר את דרך עץ החיים

And he settled in front of the garden of Eden the Cherubim
and the flame of the turning sword to guard the way (to) the
tree of the life¹³⁹

(Gen 3.24b).

Hendel argues, less convincingly, that the sword is an independent divine agent¹⁴⁰. It is seen, rather, as the 'divine weapon'¹⁴¹ of the guardian deities. Miller relates the Cherubim and the flaming sword to the Ugaritic divine messengers of fire (KTU 1.2 i 32-3)¹⁴². At any rate, the Cherubim may take a 'warrior' role here guarding the entrance to the garden¹⁴³.

For their motifs, Cassuto suggests persuasively that the Cherubim and the flaming sword in the garden may be derived from atmospheric phenomena: 'winds' and 'lightning flashes', respectively¹⁴⁴. In fact, the Cherubim are paralleled with the wind in other descriptions:

וירכב על כרוב ויעף

And he rode¹⁴⁵ upon a Cherub and
he flew;

וירא על כנפי רוח

and he is seen¹⁴⁶ upon wings of the
wind

¹³⁹ Lit., 'the lives'.

¹⁴⁰ Hendel (1985: 672-3) utters that it is an "independent fiery being, a divine being in the service to Yahweh, in precisely the same category as the cherubim".

¹⁴¹ L'Heureux (1983: 23).

¹⁴² Miller (1965: 259).

¹⁴³ Wyatt (1996: 53) argues that the garden is located in the centre of the world.

¹⁴⁴ Cassuto (1961: 176): "If the cherubim are actually the winds blowing in the skies, then the flaming fire and the sword-flame are none other than the lightning flashes, which appear in the clouds like a sharp sword, drawn by the hand of the cherubim, and turning" around.

¹⁴⁵ The רכב, 'mount, mount and sit, ride': BDB 938; HALOT 123-3. Cf. Akk. *rakābu*: AHw 944; CAD 14[R] 83-91; and Ug. *rkb*, which is used mainly for riding a chariot: DUL 739.

The Davidic song in 2 Sam 22 corresponds almost identically to Ps 18. In these psalms Yahweh is praised by a human for his divine help; he appears as the wind-rider here to provide a human with his divine protection. Here the role of the כרוּב appears variously. The רוּחַ is explicitly paralleled with the כרוּב as taking the role of the 'carrier'¹⁴⁷ agent of Yahweh¹⁴⁸. On the other hand the כרוּב may be regarded as the 'guardian' agent who cooperates with their master god coming for the divine protection.

As the 'carrier' deity the Cherubim represent the presence of Yahweh¹⁴⁹: they are conveying the throne of their master god in their theophanies (Ezek 10.1-9, 11, 14-20; 11.22). The role of the Cherubim as the guardian deities in the garden is repeated in Ezekiel's prophecy on the king of Tyre who typifies this divine being (Ezek 28.14, 16). In the description the anonymous כרוּב is represented as a created being: בְּיוֹם הַבְּרָאָה, 'in the day you were created' (Ezek 28.13, 15)¹⁵⁰.

The status of this particular כרוּב adorned with precious stone, jewellery, and gold may indicate his high rank among other lesser deities. As well, he is described as being charged with a mission, probably to guard the

¹⁴⁶ In Ps 18.11 the וִירָא is replaced by the וִירָא, 'and he flew swiftly', in order to make it meaningful.

¹⁴⁷ Thus they are the "embodiment of the strong winds, which drive the clouds of the sky, the chariots of the Holy One"; that is to say, "symbolization of the winds": Cassuto (1961: 175).

¹⁴⁸ It has been discussed that Yahweh may ride on the Cherub; or he mounts on it; or he rides in a chariot led by the Cherubim: Metzger (1985: 310-1). But it seems more likely to express that the supreme god has a ride on the Cherub here since the כרוּב appears as a singular (cf. Ps 104.3; Isa 19.1). Similarly, Baal is suggested frequently as *rkb* רִכַּב, 'Charioteer of Clouds' (Cf. KTU 1.2 iv 8 and *passim*). Cf. Mettinger (1999c: 921).

¹⁴⁹ Janowski (1991: 231-64).

¹⁵⁰ Thus they are viewed not as gods but as creatures: Keil (1876: 414).

mountain of Yahweh: the garden¹⁵¹. This כרוב is also portrayed as being fully wise, perfectly beautiful¹⁵², and splendid¹⁵³. He may be seen as a luminous figure¹⁵⁴. His function is explained explicitly in the phrase כרוב ממשח הסוכך, 'you (are) an anointed¹⁵⁵ Kerub who is covering¹⁵⁶' (Ezek 28.14a; also, v. 16). The function of this כרוב, charged with the task to protect the garden, alludes to that of the Cherubim put in order to guard the כפרת (mercy seat¹⁵⁷).

2.4.1.1. Cherubim Decorated as Guardian Deities

The Cherubim were put as a complementary part of the mercy seat in the Most Holy place of the tent of Yahweh; two Cherubim, spreading their wings, were made of hammered gold and were placed at each end of the mercy seat¹⁵⁸, facing each other toward the mercy seat¹⁵⁹. As well, they were used as

¹⁵¹ The גן אלהים, the 'garden of God' (Ezek 28.13); the הר קדש אלהים, the 'holy mountain of God' (v. 14); and the הר אלהים, the 'mountain of God' (v. 16) are paralleled as the abode of Yahweh in the descriptions. The garden and the mountain are the significant motifs to represent the 'centre of the world': Wyatt (1996: 27).

¹⁵² Ezek 28.12b reads מלא חכמה וכליל יפי (you are) 'full of wisdom and perfect (in) beauty'.

¹⁵³ Ezek 28.7: יפעתך ... יפי חכמתך, 'beauty of your wisdom ... your splendour'; and also, יפעתך ... ביפוך, 'in your beauty ... your splendour' (v. 17).

¹⁵⁴ It is described that the Cherub was walking in the חוך אבני אש, 'midst of stones of fire' (Ezek 28.14, 16). The theophanic motif of this divine agent with a stone of fire from the vicinity of Yahweh's throne is similarly found in the case of the Seraphim in Isa 6.6; cf. Ezek 1.4-5, 13 (נחלי אש בערוה, 'burning coals of fire'), 27; Dan 7.9-10.

¹⁵⁵ The noun form ממשח occurs only once at this place. It may be derived from the מִשַּׁח, to 'anoint': HALOT 643-4.

¹⁵⁶ The סכך means 'to protect, cover': GHCOTS 586; HALOT 754.

¹⁵⁷ 'Atonement': HALOT 495; NAB; 'cover': NJPS; 'atonement cover': NIV. Other major translations interpret it as 'mercy seat': ASV; KJV; NASB; NJB; and RSV. Here through the same 'guardian' function of the Cherubim it may be said that the garden is viewed as the temple, meaning the same 'centre of the world' where it must be protected by the divine force.

¹⁵⁸ Exod 25.18-20, 22; 37.7-9; and Num 7.89. Thus Yahweh is described as sitting on them: יהוה צבאות יושב הכרובים, 'Yahweh of the hosts, sitting (on) the Cherubim' (2 Sam 6.2; also, 1 Sam 4.4).

a decorative image on the curtains of the tabernacle¹⁶⁰. They may represent the celestial hosts or guardian deities who are surrounding Yahweh in the closest distance since the 'earthly sanctuary' corresponds to the 'heavenly sanctuary'¹⁶¹ and vice versa.

Cherubim appear again as a significant decorative image of the Solomonic temple. They were adopted for the decoration of the inside and outside of the walls and doors of the temple, along with palm trees and flowers¹⁶². As well, they made up part of the motif on the rolling bronze stands with lions, bulls, and palm trees¹⁶³. And finally, they occupied a role in the art of the sanctuary veil¹⁶⁴. Moreover, two Cherubim figures were put in the *דביר*, 'Shrine'¹⁶⁵, so that the ark of the covenant was situated under their spread wings¹⁶⁶.

Some have viewed them anthropomorphically because they are standing (2 Chr 3.13)¹⁶⁷. Yet the paralleled arrangement with bulls and lions

¹⁵⁹ Some have argued that the description that the Cherubim have their faces toward each other may indicate that they are anthropomorphic: Gressmann (1926-7: 149, fig. 513); Colunga (1941: 153). However, they seem to be theriomorphic in appearance like a winged bull or horse with a human head. Cf. 2 Sam 22.11; Ps 18.11 above; the *כרוּב* appears as a carrier that Yahweh can ride and drive; and the denotation of the *רכב* indicates also that the *כרוּב* is more likely theriomorphic.

¹⁶⁰ Exod 26.1, 31; 36.8, 35.

¹⁶¹ Cassuto (1967: 322).

¹⁶² 1 Kgs 6.29, 32, 35; and 2 Chr 3.7.

¹⁶³ 1 Kgs 7.29, 36.

¹⁶⁴ 2 Chr 3.14.

¹⁶⁵ NJPS. See HALOT 208: 'sacred shrine', relating to Eg. *dbr* and Copt. *ταβύρ*. The term is paralleled with the *קדש הקדשים*, the 'Holy of Holies' (1 Kgs 8.6). Cf. Ug. *dbr*, 'chapel': DUL 264 (III); Pun. *dbr*, 'hindmost chamber': DNWSI 240; *dbr*₄.

¹⁶⁶ 1 Kgs 6.23-8; 8.6-7; 1 Chr 28.18; 2 Chr 3.10-3; 5.7-8.

¹⁶⁷ F. Landsberger (1947: 234); Metzger (1985: 365); Mettinger (1999c: 922). MT reads the text as *והם עמדים על רגליהם*, 'and they were standing on their feet'. The *רגל* can be construed either as a dual or pl. Their supposed shape from other biblical references is more convincingly associated with the idea of a quadruped animal.

may indicate the Cherubim are quadrupeds rather than bipeds¹⁶⁸. Their appearance and role on the mercy seat in the tabernacle and in the inner sanctuary of the temple are very similar in that they take their role as guardian deities¹⁶⁹. In Ezekiel's vision, the Cherubim appear as being carved along with palm trees on the door and on the walls of the sanctuary (Ezek 41.18-20, 25); here they have two faces: one is human and the other is that of a lion, toward the palm trees on each side (vv. 18-9)¹⁷⁰. They may be suggested as the guardian deities of the tree here (cf. Gen 3.24).

2.4.2. Cherubim as Servant Deities

As well as guardian deities they function as servant deities placed close to the sacred throne of Yahweh or as the throne itself¹⁷¹. Thus they represent the glorious presence of Yahweh (Ezek 9.3; 11.22). Four living beings in Ezek 1 can be identified with the Cherubim in Ezek 10 in that their appearances are related closely to the throne of Yahweh and to the divine assembly surrounding him (Ezek 10.15, 20). In Ezek 1.5-27 and 10.1-22 their appearance

¹⁶⁸ A representation of a winged quadruped excavated in the royal tombs in Jerusalem has been interestingly interpreted as the biblical Cherubim: Clermont-Ganneau (1899: [1] 244-7); Dhorme-Vincent (1926: 493-4); and de Vaux (1961: 117). After a comparison with the paralleled Mesopotamian iconography, Keel (1977: 15-45) also identifies the Cherubim of the Solomonic temple as the winged quadrupeds. For further iconographical references to the Cherubim as quadrupeds, see Keel-Uehlinger (1998: 56, 155-8, and 168).

¹⁶⁹ Haran (1978: 249) argues that the two Cherubim in the temple are the "exact counterpart" of the two Cherubim on the mercy seat in the tabernacle.

¹⁷⁰ The text reads *וּשְׁנַיִם פָּנִים לְכַרֻּב וּפְנֵי אָדָם ... וּפְנֵי כַפִּיר*, 'and two faces (are) to (each) Cherub ... and a face of a man ... and a face of a lion'. The cherubim are positioned separately by palm trees: *בֵּין כַּרֻּב לְכַרֻּב*, 'and a palm tree (is) between a Cherub and a Cherub' (Ezek 41.18).

¹⁷¹ Ps 80.2; 99.1; Isa 37.16; 2 Kgs 19.15; and 1 Chr 13.6. In these biblical references the participial form of the *יָשַׁב*, to 'sit, remain, dwell' (BDB 442; HALOT 444-5), signifies Yahweh enthroned on the Cherubim. Since the term is closely related to the idea of the enthronement of the kingship (1 Sam 4.4; 1 Kgs 1.46, etc.), it may indicate that Yahweh is enthroned on the Cherubim who indeed *are* the throne of his divine kingship.

is expressed enigmatically: in a humanlike form¹⁷²; as four-faced figures¹⁷³; as having four wings¹⁷⁴; as having their feet like those of an ox¹⁷⁵; and as having eyes all over their bodies¹⁷⁶.

They are also described as radiant beings¹⁷⁷ and their rapid moving steps are compared to lightning¹⁷⁸. The mission of these four-faced beings is closely related: to convey the throne of Yahweh as his 'carrier' deities or 'servant' deities (Ezek 10.1-9, 11, 14-20; and 11.22)¹⁷⁹.

¹⁷² Cf. Ezek 1.5b: וזה מראה דמות אדם להנה 'this (is) their appearance; a likeness of man (is) to them'; and also, the expression ידי אדם 'hands of a man' (Ezek 1.8a; 10.7, 8, 21).

¹⁷³ Cf. the phrase וארבעה פנים לאחת 'and four faces to (each) one' (Ezek 1.6a; 10.14, 21; cf. 1.10). Eichrodt (1970: 57) properly comments that these divine beings are "servants of the great world-God, and they carry in themselves some of the uniqueness of Yahweh". Zimmerli (1979-83: [1] 120) argues that they may signify the "omnipotence of Yahweh which is affective in every direction". But it more probably indicates their prompt mobility (Ezek 1.14); thus Greenberg (1983: 159-60) cogently interprets their function at Ezek 1.12, remarking that "they gave the impression of a unity as they moved, facing in every direction, and always went in the direction they faced, without needing to turn".

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Ezek 1.8a: וארבע כנפים לאחת להם 'and four wings (are) to (each) one, to them' (Ezek 1.6b); and the next phrase וידי אדם מתחת כנפיהם על ארבעת רבעיהם 'and hands of a man (are) under wings on their four sides'. Hence their wings cause thunderous sound: כנפיהן 'and I hear the sound of their wings, like the sound of many waters, like the sound of Shaddai, in their going, the sound of tumult, like the sound of a camp, in their standing they let drop their wings' (Ezek 1.24).

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Ezek 1.7a: ורגליהם רגל ישרה וכף רגליהם ככף רגל עגל 'and their feet (are) a straight foot and a sole of their feet (is) like a sole of a foot of a calf'.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Ezek 10.12a: וכל בשרם וגבהם וידיהם וכנפיהם והאופנים מלאים עינים סביב 'and all their flesh and their backs, and their hands, and their wings, and the wheels (are) full of eyes round about'.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Ezek 1.7b: והחיות רצוא ושוב כמראה הבזק 'and the living beings are running and turning back like the appearance of the flash'.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Ezek 1.14: ונצצים כעין נחשת קלל 'and they are sparkling like an eye of burnished bronze'; thus KJV translates it as '... like the colour of ...'. Moreover each entity has a wheel for their prompt mobility (Ezek 1.15-21). The wheels give them a very unique appearance.

¹⁷⁹ El as the enthroned deity is compared with Baal (*rkb 'rpt*, the 'Charioteer of the Clouds') in the Ugaritic mythology (KTU 1.2 iv 8, 29, etc.): Mettinger (1982: 35-6).

2.4.3. Other Roles of Cherubim

There is no statement that the Cherubim (or the Seraphim) were messengers of Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible. Their roles in the Heavens are beyond that of messengers. Therefore their roles are regarded largely as twofold: 'guardians' or 'servants'.

Summary

The guardian deities are found frequently in the Hebrew Bible (Deut 32.8-9, etc.). The divine beings entitled as the מלאכ(ים), 'messenger(s)', also take the role of divine guardians (Gen 32.2-3). In the descriptions of psalms, the יהוה מלאך, the 'messenger of Yahweh', occurs as the guardian deity (Ps 32.8; 34.8 [ET 34.7]; 91.11-2, etc.). The מלאך יהוה guards humans on the way for their safety (Gen 24.7, 40; Exod 14.19; 23.20, 23; 32.34; 33.2; Ps 34.8 [ET 34.7]; and Tob 5.21). In Exod 23.20-23, the role of the מלאך occurs variously: the divine messenger, guardian, and forgiver.

The כרובים, 'Cherubim', is regarded as the divine guardian (Gen 3.24 b; Ezek 28.14a, 16), which is related to a colossus of a protective spirit placed at a temple gate or a sphinx in ancient Near East. It is connected, perhaps, to the dog at the tomb in the Ugaritic texts (KTU 1.16 i 2-3). They are described as flying, as the wind-rider (2 Sam 22.11; Ps 18.11 [ET 18.10]). They also carry Yahweh's throne (Ezek 10.1-9, 11, 14-20; 11.22). The Cherubim occur as a complementary part of the mercy seat in the Most Holy place in Yahweh's tent (Exod 25.18-20, 22; 37.7-9; Num 7.89; 2 Sam 6.2; also, 1 Sam 4.4). As a decoration, they are put on the interior and exterior walls as well as the doors of the Solomonic temple, together with palm trees and open flowers (1 Kgs 6.29, 32, 35; 2 Chr 3.7; with other things, see 1 Kgs 7.29, 36; 2 Chr 3.14, etc.). In the book of Ezekiel, they are represented also as being carved with palm trees on the door and on the walls of the sanctuary (Ezek 41.18-20, 25). As the

servant deities, the Cherubim are put near Yahweh's throne (Ps 80.2; 99.1; Isa 37.16; 2 Kgs 19.15; and 1 Chr 13.6).

3. Chanter Deities in the Hebrew Bible

Yahweh is described as surrounded by divine figures in his council (Ps 89.8 [ET 7]; 103.19-21). One of the principal functions of these lesser deities in the pantheon is to praise as a celestial choir their master god Yahweh (Job 38.7; Ps 29.1-2); thus their role of praising Yahweh in the heavens can be defined as divine chanters (Ps 148.1-2). This research will scrutinise the divine chanters in the Hebrew Bible, analysing some biblical Hebrew texts related to the subject.

3.1. Job 38.7

In Job 38.7, the celestial beings are summoned to be a chorus to give praise to Yahweh. The בני אלהים are acknowledged to be present at the time of Creation. After Yahweh asks where Job was at during Creation (v. 4), he says:

ברן יחד כוכבי בקר	When the morning Stars ¹⁸⁰ sang
	together,
ויריעו כל בני אלהים	and all the Sons of God shouted (for joy)?
	(Job 38.7) ¹⁸¹ .

Their function here as celestial chanters praising, with joy, the amazingly creative work of Yahweh and his sovereignty is explicitly expressed. Thus, Parker relates these divine beings to the gods other than Yahweh, designated

¹⁸⁰ Heb. כוכב, 'star': HALOT 463. It is used here as an epithet of divine beings.

¹⁸¹ LXX reads the text as ὅτε ἐγενήθησαν ἄστρα ἤνεσάν με φωνῇ μεγάλῃ πάντες ἄγγελοί μου, 'when stars were created, all my messengers praised me (with) a loud voice'.

explicitly in the first person plural form 'us' in the event of Creation at Gen 1.26¹⁸².

In the passage, the כוכבי בקר and the בני אלהים are used in parallel¹⁸³. The parallel of stars and divine beings is also found in the Ugaritic texts. In KTU 1.10 i 3-4, the *phr kkbm*, the 'assembly of Stars' is paralleled with the *bn il*, 'Sons of El', and the *dr dt šmm*, the 'circle of those of the heavens' to designate the lesser deities in the pantheon. Cassuto states conceivably that the כוכב, 'which were deities in the idolatrous cult, were transformed into servants of the Lord in Israel's religion (likewise in Ugaritic, the phrase *phr kbkbm*, that is, *congregation of the stars*, corresponds to *bn 'il* ['sons of God']; and the assembly of *the sons of God* that came to present themselves before the Lord in Job i 6 and ii 1 is paralleled by the gathering of *the host of heaven* in i Kings xxii 19'¹⁸⁴.

Therefore, the ברין is juxtaposed with the synonymous term רוע. Divine beings here appear as the 'group' chanters in a same voice; thus, each verb is followed by other adverbs: יחד, 'together', and כל, 'all', respectively¹⁸⁵. The celestial hymn for Yahweh is harmonised by these 'group' chanters.

3.2. Psalm 103.19-21

v. 19

יהוה בשמים הכין כסאו

ומלכותו בכל משלה

Yahweh in the heavens established his throne; and his
sovereignty rules over all.

¹⁸² Parker (1999c: 798).

¹⁸³ Cross (1953: 274 n. 1); Habel (1985: 538); Hartley (1988: 495 n. 21). Cf. Isa 14.12; Ps 148.2, 3.

¹⁸⁴ Cassuto (1961: 293).

¹⁸⁵ Habel (1985: 538) remarks that "The sons of God who celebrate the construction of earth are presumably the entire entourage of the divine court".

Adore (with bended knees) Yahweh, O his messengers, mighty ones of power, who perform his word, hearing the voice of his word.

Adore (with bended knees) Yahweh, all his hosts¹⁸⁶, who serve him, doing his will'.

In the passage some terms indicate the identity and the rank of divine beings other than Yahweh. The expressions בַּשָּׁמַיִם (a) and כְּסֵאוֹ (b) in v. 19 may point out both the celestial abode of Yahweh and his enthronement there. But they may also signify the rank of the divine beings other than Yahweh.

Yahweh appears here as having royal authority as the king of kings; all in the cosmic world are to be under his sovereignty (cf. Ps 47.8; 93.2; and 102.13 [ET 12]). Hence, all the divine beings in the assembly are subordinate to him and they are urged to join in the chorus of praise to their head god. These denotations, therefore, paralleled chiastically with the other terms מַלְכוּתוֹ (b') and בְּכָל (a'), evidently show the relationship of other divine beings to Yahweh as his lesser deities. Secondly, the primary meaning of the repeatedly employed term בָּרַךְ delivers the postural sense. As the Piel form of בָּרַךְ, to 'kneel down'¹⁸⁷, it is used to demand the obeisant position from other divine beings to and their adoration of Yahweh. Thus, denoting 'kneeling' or 'bowing', this imperative verb as the non-verbal indication¹⁸⁸ designates the lower rank of the deities other than Yahweh.

The first title for the lesser deities appears as מַלְאָכָיו in v. 20. From its usage in the passage, it can be posited that the divine messengers are obliged

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Dahood (1966-70: [3] 30) interprets it as 'soldiers' rather than 'host'.

¹⁸⁷ BDB 138; HALOT 159; or to 'praise, extol, bless', because it has Yahweh as the object at this place: Scharbert (1977: 293, 305).

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Gruber (1980: 90-8).

to take any tasks other than their primary mission to convey messages; such as divine chanters here (ברכו). The *גברי כח* follows as the second title for the lesser deities. The first term of the phrase *גברי כח* in v. 20 denotes their status qualified as warrior deities¹⁸⁹. The function of the *גברי כח* can be suggested from the first term *עשי* of the *עשי דברו*, which indicates their mission to execute the command of their master god, obeying (לשמע) his word. The same understanding is to be discerned in the *עשי רצונו* in v. 21. These mighty warriors are also members of the divine assembly of Yahweh in that they execute their master god's command.

Lesser deities are also called *צבאי* in v. 21. The *צבא* is a collective noun, which also designates the military force of Yahweh. The function of the *צבאי* is explained by the term *משרתי*, followed by *עשי רצונו*, which places their position without a doubt as lesser deities or divine agents¹⁹⁰. According to Cross, the military designation of the *צבא* (or *צבאח*) refers, as a synonym, to the 'council' of Yahweh (cf. 1 Kgs 22.19; Deut 4.19)¹⁹¹. All these titles are used to identify the same lesser deities¹⁹². Thus their titles may depend on the diverse functions which they are performing.

The text presents the divine assembly as including messenger deities and warrior deities among its members. Thus it can be concluded that the members of the divine assembly have two main functions: delivering Yahweh's message and executing his command; and in doing so they participate in the reign of Yahweh. Yet in the divine assembly their functions

¹⁸⁹ The intensive form of the adjective *גבר*, to 'be strong', is used here as the military title of divine beings: HALOT 172. Cf. Kosmala (1975: 373-6).

¹⁹⁰ It is evidently found in the Hebrew Bible (Job 38.7; Ps 103.19-21; 148.1-3) that the warrior deities may take a role chanting towards their supreme god.

¹⁹¹ Cross (1953: 274 n. 1): Akk. *puḫru* (= Sum. *ukkin*) denotes both 'council' and 'army'. Cf. G.E. Wright (1950: 33).

¹⁹² Dahood (1966-70: [3] 30) points out that divine soldiers are identified as divine messengers and that divine servants and divine messengers are the same figures. Also, Holladay (1993: 61). Cf. Ps 148.2.

are not differentiated when they take the role of the divine chanter in union. In other words, the chanting role of lesser deities becomes a functionally common denominator to their various roles, as in Ps 148.1-5.

3.3. Psalm 148.1-3

הללו יה	Praise Yah(weh);
הללו את יהוה מן השמים	praise Yahweh from the heavens;
הללוהו במרומים	praise him in the heights;
הללוהו כל מלאכיו	praise him, all his messengers;
הללוהו כל צבאו	praise him, all his host ¹⁹³ ;
הללוהו שמש וירח	praise him, sun and moon;
הללוהו כל כוכבי אור	praise him, all stars of light ¹⁹⁴ .

The psalm begins by calling upon all the heavenly beings to give praise to Yahweh. In the passages, Heb. **השמים** and **מרומים** occur synonymously. Then, the divine messengers, the host, and the stars in the celestial council are paralleled with the modification of the term **כל**. These celestial beings here appear explicitly as the divine chanters to praise Yahweh.

3.4. Seraphim

The **שרפים** appears only in the references of Isaiah (Isa 6.1-4, 6-7), where they are described as the divine servants upon the throne of Yahweh, 'singing the trishagion'¹⁹⁵:

שרפים עמדים ממעל לו שש כנפים שש כנפים לאחד בשתים יכסה פניו
ובשתים יכסה רגליו ובשתים יעופף

¹⁹³ Or, 'soldiers': Dahood (1966-70: [3] 30). The Qere reads it as **צבאיו**. In any case, it takes a military sense.

¹⁹⁴ A hapax legomenon. Cf. Dahood (1966-70: [3] 353): 'stars of morning'. A.A. Anderson comments that "They may be regarded as part of his heavenly host". Cf. Job 38.7.

¹⁹⁵ Mettinger (1999b: 742).

Seraphim were standing above him¹⁹⁶. Six wings six wings¹⁹⁷ for each one; with two he covered his face¹⁹⁸; and with two he covered his feet; and with two he flew.

וקרא זה אל זה ואמר קדוש קדוש יהוה צבאות מלא כל הארץ
כבודו

And this one called to that one; and said "holy, holy, holy¹⁹⁹ (is) Yahweh of hosts; the fullness of all the earth (is) his glory"

(Isa 6.2-3).

The etymological root of שרפים is normally referred to the שרף, to 'burn, consume'²⁰⁰. In this sense of the term the Seraphim may be recognised as the radiant figures. On the other hand, it has been said that the Seraphim are snakes since the שרף is also used to denote 'serpent' in the Hebrew Bible²⁰¹. However, the text of Isaiah 6 only gives the name of these lesser deities²⁰²,

¹⁹⁶ ממעל לו; lit., 'from above to him'.

¹⁹⁷ The shape of the Seraphim is described as six-winged here. The repetition of the number indicates the distribution to each of the entities. The dual form of the כנף expresses the idea of distribution as well so that each one has three pairs of wings rather than six wings as its plural form: Kautzsch (1910: §134; q); Paul Joüon (1923: §91; e). At any rate the text informs that lesser deities may be winged; at least in the case of the Seraphim: Auvray (1972: 87).

¹⁹⁸ It is the face of the שרף. As following Keel (1977: 113), Mettinger (1999b: 743) remarks that "instead of protecting Yahweh the seraphim need their wings to cover themselves from head to feet from Yahweh's consuming holiness; Yahweh does not need their protection".

¹⁹⁹ The trisagion is applied to magnify the praise of Yahweh's holiness: Slotki (1949: 29).

²⁰⁰ GHCLOTS 795; BDB 976; HALOT 1358-9; and cf. Exod 32.20; Lev 13.55; 1 Kgs 13.2, etc. For its cognates with the same meaning, see Akk. *šarāpu* (AHw 1185; CAD 17/2[Š] 50-3); Ug. *šrp* (UT §19.2489; DUL 844); and Aram. *šrp* (DNWSI 1194).

²⁰¹ Num 21.6, 8; Deut 8.15; and Isa 14.29, 30.6. Thus, Joines (1967; 1974: 42-60); Ward (1968); de Saignac (1972); Keel (1977: 70-191); and Mettinger (1999b). Also, cf. Engnell (1949: 33, n. 3); Feliks (1962: 107): 'cobra'; Keel (1982: 165-6).

²⁰² Kissane (1941: 74).

suggesting their theophanic manifestation in 'lightning' or 'burning' form²⁰³. Inasmuch as the light symbol is related closely to the cultic meaning²⁰⁴, with this symbolic meaning, the Seraphim may function as the divine servants who represent the presence of Yahweh²⁰⁵. Moreover the description of their appearance is more likely to indicate their anthropomorphic rather than serpentine form²⁰⁶.

It has been viewed that the Seraphim are members of the divine council²⁰⁷. However, it is not certain whether they belong to the council of Yahweh due to the absence of evidence that they have taken counsel with him²⁰⁸. Whilst the members of the divine assembly are gathered together for events as at Job 1.6; 2.1, the Seraphim appear as attendants upon the throne of Yahweh²⁰⁹, which suggests that they are always keeping their position near the supreme god in his court.

In their function, they seem to be members of the group of chanters of Yahweh²¹⁰, as are the בני אלים, 'Sons of God(s)', at Ps 29.1; they are called upon to ascribe glory and strength to Yahweh and worship him; they probably belong to an inferior rank of celestial beings. Thus, these creatures

²⁰³ Young (1965: 239). Engnell (1949: 33) views the Seraphim are 'fire-and-light beings' like the Cherubim.

²⁰⁴ See 'Messenger Theophany in the Hebrew Bible' in Chapter III.

²⁰⁵ Otherwise, the origin of the Seraphim has been argued in various opinions: as having been derived from the Babylonian origin (i.e., Shedû and Lamassu, attendants of Ishtar; Morgenstern, 1914: 30); as being related to the griffin in an Egyptian iconography (Goldman, 1960: 328; Joines, 1974: 8, 55 n. 15; Görg, 1978); as the same creature as the Cherubim (no difference); but they become the Cherubim only when they get the shine of the sun (Lacheman, 1968: 71); and as personification of the lightning (J. Day, 1979: 143-5).

²⁰⁶ Isa 6.2 describes that they are 'standing above' Yahweh.

²⁰⁷ Cross (1953: 274 n. 1).

²⁰⁸ G. Cooke (1964: 37-8); Knierim (1968: 51).

²⁰⁹ Cf. Morgenstern (1939: 56-8).

²¹⁰ Biarritz (1984: 19) acceptably remarks that the Seraphim are "présente comme des êtres ailés et les définit par leur fonction liturgique".

may be grouped with the Cherubim²¹¹ as 'cultic functionaries'²¹². In this, they may perform, in an antiphonal manner (v. 3), a liturgical function as chanter deities.

One of the functions of the Seraphim is flying as well as chanting: ויַעֲף אֶלַי אֶחָד מִן הַשְּׂרָפִים, 'then one of the Seraphim flew to me' (v. 6). Furthermore, they execute the agency of redemption: וסַר עוֹנֶךָ וְחַטָּאתְךָ חִכָּר, ויִגַּע עַל פִּי ויאֲמַר הִנֵּה נִגַּע זֶה עַל שְׂפָתֶיךָ, 'And he touched on my mouth; and he said "Behold, this has touched on your lips; and your guilt is turned aside; and your sin is covered"' (v. 7).

Summary

The divine chanters in the Hebrew Bible are identified as the lesser deities of Yahweh enthroned in the divine assembly (Ps 103.19-21). This chanting role of the lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible is analogous to that of the Ugaritic chanter deities (KTU 1.1 iv 15-17; 1.23.56-57). Job 38.7 describes that the אֱלֹהִים בְּנֵי, 'Sons of God', or the כִּכְבִּים, 'Stars', are present, performing as the divine chanters, at the event of Creation. Yahweh's sovereignty is praised by numerous celestial chanters (Ps 148:1-3). The שְׂרָפִים, 'Seraphim', are described serving Yahweh as his divine chanters (Isa 6.1-4, 6-7).

4. Servant Deities in the Hebrew Bible

The investigation will now be focused on servant deities in the book of Job. The divine beings in the divine assembly are regarded here as divine servants of Yahweh; hence, the text runs:

הֵן	Behold!
בְּעַבְדָּיו לֹא יֵאֱמִין	In his servants ²¹³ he cannot trust;

²¹¹ Cf. Exod 25.10-22; 1 Sam 4.4; 1 Kgs 6.23-8; and Ezek 1.

²¹² Cf. G. Cooke (1964: 37 and n. 69).

The עבד and the מלאך appear here as being parallel in order to specify the low rank of lesser deities and also to indicate their subordinate role to Yahweh. The description of the collapse of lesser deities may be related to other biblical references to demonology (Gen 6.2-4; Ps 82.6-7; Isa 14.12; and Ezek 28)²¹⁴.

Summary

Servant deities in the Hebrew Bible are identified as lesser deities of Yahweh. They are paralleled with divine messengers (Job 4.18). As subordinate deities their role is to serve their master god Yahweh.

Conclusion to Chapter V

This chapter has dealt with the Ugaritic lesser deities other than divine messengers and warriors in the Ugaritic texts. They are represented as the mediator deities between the higher gods and humans (KTU 1.19 iv 22-25, 29-31); the guardian deities found in the epistles of ancient Ugaritians (KTU 2.13.1-8; 2.16.4-6; 5.9 i 4-6; RS 20.17.5; 20.158.5; 21.183.5; 20.255 A 2-3; RS 21.07 C 1-2; and *passim*) and in the mythological texts (KTU 1.6 iv 22-4; 1.3 ii 4-5); the chanter deities in the divine enthronement in the pantheon (KTU 1.1 iv 15-17; 1.23.56-57); and the servant deities in the mythological texts (KTU 1.2 iii 20-21; 1.3 i 2-22; 1.4 iv 59 - v 1; 1.12 i 14-7). In the Hebrew Bible the lesser deities occur as mediator deities (Job 16.19-21; 33.23-4); the guardian deities

²¹³ The עבד, 'slave, servant': BDB 713; HALOT 774-5. Cf. Ph., Pun., Aram. 'bd: DNWSI 816-9; Ug. 'bd: DUL 139-41; Akk. AHw 6; CAD 1/1[A] 51.

²¹⁴ Rowley (1970: 55) remarks that "Satan appeared among the angels in 1.6. But the meaning here does not seem to be that because all angels are not good, God does not trust any of them. It is rather that even the purest angels are still impure in the presence of God".

(Gen 32.2-3; Exod 23.20, 23; 32.34; 33.2; Ps 32.8; 34.8 [ET 34.7]; 91.11-2, etc.); the chanter deities (Ps 103.19-21; Job 38.7); and the servant deities (Job 4.18). All the roles of the lesser deities found in the Ugaritic texts are attested also in those of the lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible.

Various examples of affinities in the roles of the lesser deities in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible possibly suggest that the mythological motives of lesser deities in the Ugaritic religion may have been shared with the early conception of lesser deities in the Hebrew religion.

CONCLUSION OF THE THESIS

By synthesising the affinities that occur between the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible with regard to the conception and imagery of the nature and roles of the lesser deities, this comparative survey has reached some conclusions:

Firstly, both the Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew texts contain evidence of the polytheistic backgrounds of the divine assembly, which show that it consists hierarchically of the higher deities and other lesser deities who are associated with these higher deities. The affinity between the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible with regard to the mythological terms which denote the plural divine beings has led to the conclusion that the existence of the lesser 'gods' other than Yahweh has not been denied in the early structure of the divine assembly in the Hebrew Bible.

Secondly, both the Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew texts describe that the lesser deities have a kinship relation to their supreme god. Some Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew terms and textual references to the kinship relation of the lesser deities to their supreme god enable us to conclude that the identical 'kinship' conception of the lesser deities in the Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew texts has been shared through the use of the corresponding terms or phrases (e.g., Ug. *bn ilm*; Heb. בני אלהים).

Thirdly, while the various mythological terms used to denote the lesser deities in the Ugaritic texts are shared with the early conceptions of the

Hebrew Bible, they may have been simplified in the Hebrew Bible, probably in order to establish the absolute authority of Yahweh in the Israelite religion. It may explain the fact that while diverse titles are employed to indicate the divine messengers in the Ugaritic texts, they are simply expressed as מלאך (מלאכים) in the Hebrew Bible, which is also attested in the Ugaritic texts.

Fourthly, the similar conceptions of the activities of the messenger deities have been shared between the Ugaritic and the biblical Hebrew texts. It was also acknowledged that the procedure of the divine 'messenger' dispatch found in the Ugaritic texts is similar to that in the 'messenger' descriptions in the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, the theophany of the lesser deities accompanied with lights, clouds or winds in the Hebrew Bible is reminiscent of the theophany of the lesser deities in the Ugaritic texts.

Fifthly, the Ugaritic mythological idea of the named deities such as 'Gupan and Ugar' and 'Qadesh-and-Amurr' may be involved with the prototype of "archangels" represented as 'Gabriel' and 'Michael' in the Hebrew Bible. These named deities appear to be ranked higher than the other ordinary deities in the hierarchical divine assembly in the Ugaritic texts and the Hebrew Bible.

Sixthly, the Ugaritic and biblical Hebrew texts have shared the various motifs of the miscellaneous roles of the lesser deities other than messenger and warrior deities: thus, mediator deities, guardian deities, chanter deities, and servant deities.

The striking Ugaritic-Hebrew parallels examined and compared by philological analyses so far expose the facts that the Hebrew religious tradition has shared the same theological conceptions in the Ugaritic religion and consequently they remained as early forms of lesser deities in the Hebrew Bible.

The conclusions of the current research may become ambitions for further research. While such similarities as early forms are deeply imbedded in the Hebrew Bible, the process of their employment is interesting. Although the early Hebrew conceptions may have been dimmed later by the light of the monotheism in the Hebrew tradition, the remains reserved from the long traditional history can be evidence enough for the next research to verify the interrelation between the Ugaritic and Hebrew religious traditions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, J.S.

- 1966 *An Exegetical Study of Psalm 82*. Th.D. Diss. Cambridge: Harvard Divinity School.

Aistleitner, J.

- 1939 'Die Anat-Texte aus Ras Schamra'. *ZAW* 57: 193-211.
 1955 'Ein Opfertext aus Ugarit (No. 53) mit Exkurs über kosmologische Beziehungen der ugaritischen Mythologie'. *AcOr* 5: 1-23.
 1964 *Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra*. 2nd ed. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 1959¹.
 1974 *Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache*. 4th ed. BVSABL Phil.-Hist. Klasse Bd. 106; Heft 3. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 1958¹.

Albright, W.F.

- 1932 'The North-Canaanite Epic of 'Al'êyân Ba'al and Môt'. *JPOS* 12: 185-208.
 1933 'More Light on the Canaanite Epic of Aleyân Baal and Môt'. *BASOR* 50: 13-20.
 1934 *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society.
 1936 'The Canaanite God Haurôn (Hôrôn)'. *AJSL* 53: 1-12.
 1938a 'What were the Cherubim?'. *BA* 1: 1-3.
 1938b 'Recent Progress in North-Canaanite Research'. *BASOR* 70: 18-24.
 1941 'Are the Ephod and the Teraphim Mentioned in Ugaritic Literature?'. *BASOR* 83: 39-42.
 1950a 'The Psalm of Habakkuk'. In *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*. Edited by H.H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T&T Clark. 1-20.
 1950b 'Review of *Ugaritic Handbook* by Cyrus H. Gordon'. *JBL* 69: 385-93.
 1950-1 'A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm 1xviii)'. *HUCA* 23/1: 1-39.
 1955 'Notes on Psalms 68 and 134'. *NTT* 56: 1-12.
 1957 *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1940¹.
 1958 'An Ostrakon from Calahand the North-Israelite Diaspora'. *BASOR* 149: 33-6.

- 1959 'Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII'. VT 9: 339-46.
- 1968a *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. 5th ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1942¹; 1956⁴.
- 1968b *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths*. JLCRS 7. London: Athlone Press.
- Allan, R.
- 1999 'Now That Summer's Gone: Understanding QZ in KTU 1.24'. SEL 16: 19-25.
- Allen, L.C.
- 1983 *Psalms, 101-150*. WBC 21. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Alomía, K.M.
- 1987 *Lesser Gods of the Ancient Near East and Some Comparisons with Heavenly Beings of the Old Testament*. Ph.D. Diss. Andrews University.
- Altmann, A. (ed.)
- 1966 *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*. Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University. Studies and Texts: Vol. 3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Al-Yasin, I.-al-D.
- 1952 *The Lexical Relation Between Ugaritic and Arabic*. SSMS 1. New York: Department of Semitics of Shelton College.
- Anderson, A.A.
- 1972 *The Book of Psalms*. 2 vols. NCB. London: Oliphants.
- Anderson, B.W.
- 1983 *Out of the Depths: The Psalms Speak for Us Today*. Rev. and expanded ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Armstrong, G.T.
- 1962 *Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche: die drei Kirchenväter*. BGBH 4. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

- Arnaud, D.
 1986 *Emar. VI, 3. Textes sumériens et accadiens*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
 1991 'Contribution de l'onomastique du Moyen-Euphrate à la connaissance de l'Emariote'. *SEL* 8: 23-46.
- Astour, M.C.
 1966 'Some New Divine Names from Ugarit'. *JAOS* 86: 277-84.
 1969 'La triade de déesses de fertilité à Ugarit et en Grèce'. *Ug* 6: 9-23.
 1998 'RDMN/RHADAMANTHYS and the Motif of Selective Immortality'. In Dietrich-Kottsieper (1998). 55-89.
- Auvray, P.
 1972 *Isaïe 1-39*. Paris: J. Gabalda.
- Avishur, Y.
 1979 'Psalm 29: Canaanite or Hebrew?'. In *Sefer Ben Tsiyon Luria*. Edited by Z. Shazar, et al. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher. 247-74.
 1981 'The Ghost-Expelling Incantation from Ugarit'. *UF* 13: 13-25.
 1994 *Studies in Hebrew and Ugaritic Psalms*. Publications of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Barnett, R.D.
 1977 'Cherubim and the Temple of Solomon'. In *Illustrations of Old Testament History*. 2nd ed. London: British Museum Publications for the Trustees of the British Museum. 46-7.
- Barthélemy, D.
 1963 'Les tiqquné sopherim et la critique textuelle de l'ancien Testament'. In *Congress Volume: Bonn 1962*. Edited by G.W. Anderson et. al. VTSup 9. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 285-304.
- Bauer, H.
 1933 'Die Gottheiten von Ras Schamra'. *ZAW* 51: 81-101.
 1934 'Semitistik, Islamistik'. *OLZ* 37: cols. 238-47.
 1936 *Die alphabetischen Keilschrifttexte von Ras Schamra*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Beeston, A.F.L.
 1951 'Angels in Deuteronomy 33:2'. *JTS* 2: 30-1.

- Biarritz, D.E.
 1984 'Les structures symboliques d'Esäie 6, une hypothèse'. *FoiVie* 83: 16-24.
- Binger, T.
 1997 *Asherah: Goddesses in Ugarit, Israel and the Old Testament*. JSOTSup 232; CIS 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Birney, L.
 1970 'An Exegetical Study of Genesis 6:14'. *JETS* 13: 43-52.
- Blenkinsopp, J.
 1961 'Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah: A Discussion'. *Bib* 42: 61-76.
- Block, D.I.
 1988 *The Gods of the Nations: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern National Theology*. ETSM 2. Jackson, MS: Evangelical Theological Society.
- Boda, M.J.
 1993 'Ideal Sonship at Ugarit'. *UF* 25: 9-24.
- Boecker, H.J.
 1964 *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im Alten Testament*. WMANT 14. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Boling, R.G.
 1975 *Joshua*. AB 6. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Bordreuil, P., and A. Caquot
 1980 'Les textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découverts en 1978 à Ibn Hani'. *Syria* 57: 343-73.
- Bordreuil, P., and D. Pardee
 1993 'Le combat de Ba'lu avec Yammu d'après les textes ougaritiques'. *MARI* 7: 63-70.
- Briggs, C.A., and E.G. Briggs
 1906-7 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. Vol. 2. ICC 15. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.

Brockelmann, C.

- 1966 *Lexicon Syriacum*. Hildesheim: G. Olms. Repr.; Halis Saxonum: Sumptibus M. Niemeyer. 1928². 1895¹.

Brooke, G.J.

- 1979 'The Textual, Formal and Historical Significance of Ugaritic Letters'. *UF* 11: 69-87.

Brueggemann, W.

- 1962 'Gabriel'. *IDB* 2: 332-3.
1982 *Genesis*. IBC. Atlanta: John Knox Press.
1984 *The Message of the Psalms: A Theological Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg.

Budde, K.

- 1922 *Der Segen Mose's: Deut. 33; Erläutert und übersetzt von Karl Budde*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Burnett, J.S.

- 2001 *A Reassessment of Biblical Elohim*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Buttenwieser, M.

- 1938 *The Psalms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Canney, M.A.

- 1923-4 'The Hebrew *mēliš*'. *AJSL* 40: 135-7.

Caquot, A.

- 1956 'In splendoribus sanctorum'. *Syria* 33: 36-41.
1970 'Le Psaume LXVIII'. *RHR* 177: 147-82.
1978 'Remarques sur la tablette ougaritique RS 1929 No 6 (CTA 13)'. *ErIsr* 14: 14-8.
1978-9 'Nouveaux textes ougaritiques de Ras Ibn Hani'. *ACF* 79. 488-90.
1985 'Raphaim'. *DBSup* 10: 344-57.
1989 'Textes religieux'. In Caquot, de Tarragon and Cunchillos (1989). 7-123.

Caquot, A., and M. Sznycer

- 1970 'Textes ougaritiques'. In *Les religions du Proche-Orient asiatique: Textes babyloniens, ougaritiques, hittites*. Caquot, A., R. Labat, M. Sznycer and M. Vieyra. Paris: Fayard.
- 1974 See Caquot, Sznycer and Herdner (1974).

Caquot, A., M. Sznycer and A. Herdner

- 1974 *Textes Ougaritiques I: Mythes et légendes*. LAPO 7. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Caquot, A., J.-M. de Tarragon and J.-L. Cunchillos

- 1989 *Textes Ougaritiques II: Textes religieux et rituels; Correspondance*. LAPO 14. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Cassuto, U.

- 1961 *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Vol. 1. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- 1967 *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- 1971 *The Goddess Anat*. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- 1973a 'The Episode of the Sons of God and the Daughters of Man (Genesis vi 1-4)'. *BOS* 1: 17-28.
- 1973b 'Deuteronomy Chapter XXXIII and the New Year in Ancient Israel'. *BOS* 1: 47-70.
- 1975 'Asherah's Journey in the Ugaritic Texts'. *BOS* 2: 178-87.

Cazelles, H.

- 1956 'L'hymne ougaritique à Anat'. *Syria* 33: 49-57.

Childs, B.S.

- 1962 *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament*. SBT 27. SCM Press. 1960¹.
- 1974 *The Book of Exodus*. OTL. Louisville: WestminsterJohnKnox Press.

Christensen, A.L.

- 1977 'Ugarit Epistolary Formulas: A Comparative Study of the Ugaritic Epistolary Formulas in the Context of the Contemporary Akkadian Formulas in the Letters from Ugarit and Amarna'. *UF* 9: 143-58.

Christensen, D.L.

- 1984 'Two Stanzas of a Hymn in Deuteronomy 33'. *Bib* 65: 382-9.
- 2002 *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*. WBC 6B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Clear, J.

- 1976 *Ugaritic Texts in Translation*. 2nd ed. Seattle: J. Clear.

Clements, R.E.

- 1972 *Exodus*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clermont-Ganneau, C.

- 1899 *Archaeological researches in Palestine during the years 1873-1874*. Vol. 1. Translated by A. Stewart. London: the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 1896-1899.

Clifford, R.J.

- 1972 *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. HSM 4. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clines, J.A.

- 1979 'The Significance of the "Sons of God" Episode (Genesis 6:1-4) in the context of the "Primeval History"'. *JSOT* 3: 33-46.

Closen, G.E.

- 1937 *Die Sünde der "Söhne Gottes", Gen 6, 1-4*. Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut.

Cogan, M. and H. Tadmor

- 1988 *II Kings*. AB 11. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Cohen, A.

- 1945 *The Psalms*. 1st ed. SBB. London: Soncino Press.

Coleran, J.E.

- 1941 'The Sons of God in Genesis 6, 2'. *TS* 2: 488-509.

Colunga, A.

- 1941 'La vocación del profeta Ezequiel'. *EstBib* 1: 121-66.

- Collins, J.J.
 1993 *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
 1999 'Gabriel גַּבְרִיאֵל'. DDD: 338-9.
- Coogan, M.D.
 1978 *Stories from Ancient Canaan*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Cooke, G.
 1964 'The Sons of (the) God(s)'. ZAW 76: 22-47.
- Cooke, G.A.
 1936 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
- Cooper, A.
 1988 'Two Exegetical Notes on Aqht'. UF 20: 19-26.
- Coote, R.B.
 1991 *In Defense of Revolution: the Elohistic History*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Coppens, J.
 1963 'Les saints dans le psautier'. ETL 39: 485-500.
 1967 'Miscellanées Bibliques. La théophanie de Jud., V, 4-5'. ETL 43: 528-31.
- Cornelius, I.
 1994 *The Iconography of the Canaanite Gods Reshef and Ba ʿal: Late Bronze and Iron Age I periods (c 1500-1000 B.C.E.)*. OBO 140. Fribourg, Switzerland: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Cornelius, I. and H. Niehr
 2004 *Götter und Kulte in Ugarit*. ZBASAW. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern Verlag.
- Coxon, P.X.
 1999 'Gibborim גִּבּוֹרִים'. DDD: 345-6
- Craigie, P.C.
 1972 'Psalm XXIX in the Hebrew Poetry Tradition'. VT 22: 143-51.

- 1977 'Three Ugaritic Notes on the Song of Deborah'. *JSOT* 2: 33-99.
- 1978 'Debora and Anat: A Study of Poetic Imagery (Judges 5)'. *ZAW* 90: 379-80.
- 1983 *Ugarit and the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Cross, Jr., F.M.

- 1950 'Notes on a Canaanite Psalm in the Old Testament'. *BASOR* 117: 19-21.
- 1953 'The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah'. *JNES* 12: 274-7.
- 1966 'The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult'. In Altmann (1966). 11-30.
- 1973 *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cross, Jr., F.M., and D.N. Freedman

- 1948 'The Blessing of Moses'. *JBL* 67: 191-210.
- 1955 'The Song of Miriam'. *JNES* 14: 237-50.

Cunchillos, J.-L.

- 1969 'Los b'ne ha'elohîm en Gen. 6, 1-4'. *EstBib* 28: 5-31.
- 1976a *Cuando los ángeles eran dioses*. BibSal 14; Estudios 12. Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia.
- 1976b *Estudio del Salmo 29*. ISJ 6. Valencia: Soler.
- 1981a 'Étude philologique de *mal'āk*: Perspectives sur le *mal'āk* de la divinité dans la bible hébraïque'. In *Congress Volume: Vienna 1980*. Edited by J.A. Emerton. VTSup 32. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 30-51.
- 1981b 'KTU 2.21 - Lettre adressée à la reine'. *UF* 13: 45-8.
- 1982 'La'ika, mal'āk et M'elā'kāh en sémitique nord-occidental'. *RSF* 10: 153-60.
- 1983 'Una carta paradigmática de Ugarit (KTU 2.11). La carta de Talmiyanu y Ahatmiku'. *El ministerio de la palabra*. Edited by Vicente Collado and Eduardo Zurro. Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad. 61-74.
- 1984 'Expresiones de fe y la piedad en las saluciones de las cartas de Ugarit'. In Fernández Marcos, N., J. Treballe Barrera, and J. Fernández Vallina (1984): 115-28.
- 1985a 'Le dieu Mut, guerrier de El'. *Syria* 62: 205-18.
- 1985b 'La foi et la piété quotidiens dans le corps des lettres trouvées à Ugarit'. In *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor*. Edited by Caquot, A., S. Légasse, and M. Tardieu. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Berker. 67-77.

- 1989 'Correspondance'. In Caquot, de Tarragon and Cunchillos (1989). 239-421.

Cunchillos, J.-L., and J.-P. Vita

- 1995 *Concordancia de Palabras Ugaríticas en Morfología Desplegada*. BDFSN. Primera Parte: Datos Ugaríticos; II. 3 vols. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; Institución Fernando el Católico.

Dahood, M.J.

- 1958 'Ancient Semitic Deities in Syria and Palestine'. In *Le Antiche Divinità Semitiche*. Edited by S. Moscati. Rome: Istituto di Studi Orientali. 65-94.
- 1965 *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology*. BibOr 17. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- 1966-70 *Psalms*. 3 vols. AB 16-17A. New York: Doubleday.
- 1969 'Ugaritic-Hebrew Syntax and Style'. *UF* 1: 15-36.
- 1972 'Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs'. *RSP* 1: 71-382.
- 1979 'Eblaite, Ugaritic, and Hebrew Lexical Notes'. *UF* 11: 141-6.
- 1981 'Ebla, Ugarit, and the Bible'. In *The Archives of Ebla: An Empire Inscribed in Clay*. Edited by G. Pettinato. Garden City; NY: Doubleday. 271-325.

Davies, G.H.

- 1967 *Exodus*. London: SCM Press.

Davidson, A.B.

- 1889 *The Book of Job*. CBSC. London: Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, G.

- 1967 *A Dictionary of Angels*. New York: The Free Press.

Day, J.

- 1979 'Echoes of Baal's Seven Thunders and Lightnings in Psalm 29 and Habakkuk 3:9 and the Identity of the Seraphim in Isaiah 6'. *VT* 29: 143-51.
- 1985 *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. UCOP 35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Day, P.L.

- 1988 *An Adversary in Heaven: Satan in the Hebrew Bible*. HSM 43. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- 2002 'Ugaritic'. In *Beyond Babel: A Handbook for Biblical Hebrew and Related Languages*. Edited by J. Kaltner and S.L. McKenzie. RBS 42. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 223-41.

Delitzsch, F.

- 1888a *A New Commentary on Genesis*. Vol 1. CFTL 36. Translated by S. Taylor. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
- 1888b *Biblical Commentary on the Psalms*. Vol 2. Translated by D. Eaton. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Dexinger, F.

- 1966 *Sturz der Göttersöhne: oder, Engel vor der Sintflut? Versuch eines Neuverständnisses von Gen 6, 2-4 unter Berücksichtigung der religionsvergleichenden und exegetischgeschichtlichen Methode*. WBT 13. Wien: Herder.

Dhorme, É.P.

- 1967 *A Commentary on the Book of Job*. London: Nelson.

Dhorme, É.P., and L.H. Vincent

- 1926 'Les Chérubins'. RB 35: 328-58; 481-95.

Dietrich, M., and I. Kottsieper (eds.)

- 1998 'Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf': *Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient. Festschrift O. Loretz*. AOAT 250. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.

Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz

- 1967-8 'Untersuchungen zur Schrift- und Lautlehre des Ugaritischen (I): Der ugaritische Konsonant ḡ'. WO 4: 300-15.
- 1972 'Zur Ugaritischen Lexikographie (V)'. UF 4: 27-35.
- 1973 'Untersuchungen zur Schrift - und Lautlehre des ugaritischen (II): Lesehilfen in der ugaritischen Orthographie'. UF 5: 71-7.
- 1980 'Baal Rpu in KTU 1.108; 1.113 und nach 1.17 VI 25-33'. UF 12: 171-82.
- 1984a 'Ugaritisch ṣtr, atr, atry und atrī'. UF 16: 57-62.

- 1984b 'Das Ug. Nomen d(h)rt "Traum nächtliches Gesicht" (?)'. *SEL* 1: 85-8.
- 1987 'Ring und laufen als Sport in Ugarit'. *UF* 19: 19-21.
- 1992 „Jahwe und seine Ashera“: *Anthropomorphes kultbild in Mesopotamien, Ugarit und Israel: Das biblische Bilderverbot*. UBL 9. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz (eds.)

- 1995 *Ugarit: ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient: Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Forschung*. ALASP 7. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Dietrich, M., O. Loretz and J. Sanmartín

- 1973 'Die Ugaritischen Verben MRR I, MRR II und MRR III'. *UF* 5: 119-22.
- 1975 'RS 4.474 = CTA 3 - Schreibübung oder Religiöser Text?'. *UF* 7: 523-4.

Dijkstra, M.

- 1974 'Ba'lu and his Antagonists: Some Remarks on CTA 6 1-6'. *JANES* 6: 59-68.
- 1979 'Some Reflections on the Legend of Aqhat'. *UF* 11: 199-210.
- 1983 'Contributions to the Reconstruction of the Myth of Ba'al'. *UF* 15: 25-31.
- 1985 'Once Again: the Closing Lines of the Ba'al-Cycle'. *UF* 17: 149-52.
- 1988 'The Legend of Danel and the Rephaim'. *UF* 20: 35-52.

Dijkstra, M., and J.C. de Moor

- 1975 'Problematic Passages in the Legend of Aqhatu'. *UF* 7: 171-215.

Dillmann, A.

- 1897 *Genesis: Critically and Exegetically Expounded*. Vol. 1. Translated by W.B. Stevenson. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.

Donner, H.

- 1967 'Ugaritismen der Psalmenforschung'. *ZAW* 79: 332-50.

Driver, G.R.

- 1956 *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. OTS 3. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.

- Driver, S.R.
- 1900 *The Book of Daniel*. CBSC. London: Cambridge University Press.
 - 1902 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. ICC. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
 - 1908 *The Book of Job*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - 1909 *The Book of Genesis*. 7th ed. London: Methuen. 1904¹.
 - 1911 *The Book of Exodus*. CBSC. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Driver, S.R., and G.B. Gray
- 1921 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*. ICC. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
- Duhm, B.
- 1922 *Die Psalmen*. 2nd ed. KHC 14. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Durham, J. I.
- 1987 *Exodus*. WBC 3. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Dussaud, R.
- 1933 'Les Phéniciens au Négeb et en Arabie d'après un texte de Ras Shamra'. *RHR* 108: 5-49.
 - 1938 'Les combats sanglants de 'Anat et le pouvoir universel de El (V AB et VI AB)'. *RHR* 118: 133-69.
 - 1941 *Les découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l'Ancient Testament*. 2nd ed. Paris: Geuthner. 1937¹.
- Eaton, J.H.
- 1967 *Psalms*. TBC. London: SCM Press.
- Eichrodt, W.
- 1961 *Theology of the Old Testament*. Vol 1. Translated by J.A. Baker. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster.
 - 1970 *Ezekiel; A Commentary*. OTL. Translated by C. Quin. London: SCM.
- Eissfeldt, O.
- 1945-9 'Ugaritisches'. *ZDMG* 99: 29-42.
 - 1951 *El im Ugaritischen Pantheon*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
 - 1952 *Taautos und Sanchunjaton*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
 - 1956 'El and Yahweh'. *JSS* 1: 25-37.

- 1965 *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by P.R. Ackroyd. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Emerton, J.A.
1958 'The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery'. *JTS* NS 9/2: 225-42.
- Engnell, I.
1948 'The 'Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah in "Deutero-Isaiah"'. *BJRL* 31/1: 54-93.
1949 *The Call of Isaiah: An Exegetical and Comparative Study*. Uppsala: Lundequistka Bokhandeln.
- Eslinger, L.
1979 'A Contextual Identification of the *bene ha'elohim* and *benoth ha'adam* in Genesis 6:14'. *JSOT* 13: 65-73.
- Fernández Marcos, N., J. Treballe Barrera, and J. Fernández Vallina (eds.)
1984 *Simposio Bíblico Español, Salamanca, 1982*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense.
- Feliks, J.
1962 *The Animal World of the Bible: the Identification of All Animals in the Bible and Their Descriptions Based on the Bible, the Mishna, the Midrash and the Talmud and Placed in an Israeli Setting*. Translated by Pinhas Irsai. Tel-Aviv: Sinai.
- Fensham, F.C.
1963a 'Psalm 29 and Ugarit'. In *Studies on the Psalms: Papers Read at 6th Meeting Held at the Potchefstroom University for C.H.E. 29-31 January 1963*. S.A. Society for the Study of the Old Testament. Potchefstroom: Pro Rege. 84-99.
1963b 'Clauses of Protection in Hittite Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament'. *VT* 13: 133-43.
1966 'Winged Gods and Goddesses in the Ugaritic Texts'. *OrAnt* 5: 157-64.
- Fitzgerald, A.
1974 'A Note on Psalm 29'. *BASOR* 215: 61-3.

Fitzmyer, J.A.

- 1981 *The Gospel According to Luke*. I-IX. Vol. 1. AB 28. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Foley, C.M.

- 1980 *The Gracious Gods and The Royal ideology of Ugarit*. Ph.D. Diss. Hamilton, Ontario: McMaster University.

Fredriksson, H.

- 1945 'Yahweh as Commander-in-Chief and Hand-to-Hand Combatant, respectively'. In *Jahwe Als Krieger*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup. 9-67.

Freedman, D.N.

- 1960 'Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry'. ZAW72: 101-7.
1980 'The Poetic Structure of the Framework of Deuteronomy 33'. In Rendsburg-Adler-Arfa-Winter (1980). 24-46.

Freedman, D.N., and C.F. Hyland

- 1973 'Psalm 29: A Structural Analysis'. HTR 66: 237-56.

Freedman, D.N., and M.P. O'Connor

- 1995 'כְּרוֹם *k'rûb*'. TDOT 7: 307-19.

Fuerst, J.

- 1867 *A Hebrew & Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament; with an Introduction Giving a Short History of Hebrew Lexicography*. 3rd ed. Translated by S. Davidson. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz; London: Williams & Norgate.

Fulco, W.J.

- 1976 *The Canaanite God Rešep*. AOS 8. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Gallagher, W.R.

- 1994 'On the Identity of Hêlêl ben Šaḥar of Is. 14:12-15'. UF 26: 131-46.

Garr, W.R.

- 1992 'The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6:3'. JBL 111: 385-408.

Gaster, T.H.

- 1933 'Earliest Known Miracle Play?'. *Folk-Lore* 44: 379-90.
- 1934 'The Combat of 'Aleyân-Ba'al and Môt; A Proto-Hebrew Epic from Ras-Shamra; The Second Teblet; Translated from the Cuneiform Original with introduction, Provisional Translation, Argument, and Commentary'. *JRAS*: 677-714.
- 1935 'The Combat of 'Aleyân-Ba'al and Môt; A Proto-Hebrew Epic from Ras-Shamra; The Second Teblet; Translated from the Cuneiform Original with introduction, Provisional Translation, Argument, and Commentary'. *JRAS*: 1-44.
- 1937 'The Battle of the Rain and the Sea'. *Iraq* 4: 21-32.
- 1939 'Notes on the Ras Shamra Texts IV'. *OLZ* 42: 273-6.
- 1946a 'Psalm 29'. *JQR* 37: 55-65.
- 1946b 'A Canaanite Ritual Drama'. *JAOS* 66: 49-76.
- 1947a 'The Canaanite Epic of Keret'. *JQR* 38: 285-93.
- 1947b 'An Ancient Eulogy on Israel: Deuteronomy 33.3-5, 26-29'. *JBL* 66: 53-62.
- 1950 *Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East*. New York: Henry Schuman.
- 1961 *Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Gordian Press. 1950¹.
- 1969 *Myth, Legend and Custom in the Old Testament: A Comparative Study with Chapters from Sir James G. Frazer's Folklore in the Old Testament*. New York: Harper & Row.

Gelb, I.J.

- 1954 'Two Assyrian King Lists'. *JNES* 13: 209-30.

van Gemeren, W.A.

- 1981 'The Sons of God in Gen 6:1-4'. *WTJ* 43: 320-48.

Gibson, J.C.L.

- 1978 *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
- 1981-2 *Genesis*. 2 vols. DSB. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- 1998 *Language and Imagery in the Old Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Ginsberg, H.L.

- 1935b 'Notes on "The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods"'. *JRAS*: 45-72.
- 1936a *Kitbê Ugarît mêḥqārîm leshônîym*. I. Jerusalem: Bialik.

- 1936b 'The Rebellion and Death of Ba'lu'. *Or* 5: 161-98.
- 1936c 'Ba'lu and his Brethren'. *JPOS* 16: 138-49.
- 1938a 'A Phoenician Hymn in the Psalter'. In *Atti del XIX Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti, Rome, 23-29 Settembre 1935-XIII*. Roma: Tipografia del Senato, G. Bardi. 472-6.
- 1938b 'Two North-Canaanite Letters from Ugarit'. *BASOR* 72: 18-9.
- 1939 'Two Religious Borrowings in Ugaritic Literature. I. A Hurrian Myth in Semitic Dress'. *Or* 8: 317-27.
- 1944 'Baal's Two Messengers'. *BASOR* 95: 25-30.
- 1945 'The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat'. *BASOR* 98: 15-23.
- 1946 *The Legend of King Keret*. BASORSup 2-3. South Hadley, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- 1948 'On Bulletin 108 (Dec. 1947): 6-7'. *BASOR* 110: 26.
- 1969 'Ugaritic Myths, Epics and Legends'. In *ANET*: 129-55.

Gispen, W.H.

- 1982 *Exodus*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Goetze, A.

- 1938 'The Tenses of Ugaritic'. *JAOS* 58: 266-309.
- 1953 'Ugaritic Negations'. In *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen; septuagenario; A.D. VII id. nov. anno MCMLIII; a collegis discipulis amicis dicata*. Haunia: E. Munksgaard. 115-23.

Goldman, B.

- 1960 'The Development of the Lion-Griffin'. *AJA* 64: 319-28.

Good, R.M.

- 1978 'Cloud Messengers?'. *UF* 10: 436-7.
- 1984 'Some Ugaritic Terms Relating to Draught and Riding Animals'. *UF* 16: 77-81.

Gonzalez, A.W.

- 1963 'Le Psaume LXXXII'. *VT* 13: 293-309.

Gordis, R.

- 1978 *The Book of Job*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Gordon, C.H.

- 1935 'אלהים in Its Reputed Meaning of Rulers, Judges'. *JBL* 54: 139-44.
- 1949 *Ugaritic Literature*. SPIB 98. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- 1953 'Almah in Isaiah 7:14'. *JBR* 21: 106.
- 1965 *Ugaritic Textbook*. AnOr 38. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico. Revision of *Ugaritic Manuel*. 1955.
- 1977 'Poetic Legends and Myths from Ugarit'. *Berytus* 25: 5-133.
- 1978 'History of Religion in Psalm 82'. In *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies*. Edited by G.A. Tuttle. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 129-31.

Görg, M.

- 1978 'Die Funktion der Serafen bei Jesaja'. *BN* 5: 28-39.

Grabbe, L.

- 1976 'The Seasonal Pattern and the "Baal Cycle"'. *UF* 8: 57-63.

Gray, J.

- 1948-9 'The Rephaim'. *PEQ* 81. 127-39.
- 1952 'Dtn and rp'um in Ancient Ugarit'. *PEQ* 84: 39-41.
- 1964a *The Krt Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra*. 2nd ed. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1955¹.
- 1964b *I & II Kings*. OTL. London: SCM Press.
- 1965 *The Legacy of Canaan*. 2nd ed. VTSup 5. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1957¹.
- 1966 'Social Aspects of Canaanite Religion'. In *Congress Volume: Genève 1965*. Edited by G.W. Anderson et. al. VTSup 15. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 170-92.
- 1967 *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*. NCB. Edited by J. Gray. London: Nelson.
- 1977 'A Cantata of the Autumn Festival: Psalm LXVIII'. *JSS* 22: 2-26.

Greenberg, M.

- 1983 *Ezekiel 1-20*. AB 22. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Greenstein, E.L.

- 1977 'One More Step on the Staircase'. *UF* 9: 77-86.
- 1979 'Trans-Semitic Idiomatic Equivalency and the Derivation of Hebrew ml'kh'. *UF* 11: 329-36.
- 1997 'Kirta'. In Parker (1997). 9-48.

Gressmann, H.

- 1920 *Die Lade Jahves: und das Allerheiligste des salomonischen Tempels.* Berlin: W. Kohlhammer.
- 1926-7 *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament.* 2nd ed. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Grill, S.

- 1962 'Synonyme Engel Namen im Alten Testament'. *TZ* 18: 241-6.

Gröndahl, F.

- 1967 *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit.* SP 1. Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut.

Gruber, M.I.

- 1980 *Aspects of Nonverbal Communication in the Ancient Near East.* 2 vols. SP 12/I, II. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

Gruenthaner, M.J.

- 1944 'Demonology of the Old Testament'. *CBQ* 6: 6-27.

Gunkel, H.

- 1928 *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays.* Translated by the Rev. A.K. Dallas. London: G. Allen & Unwin.
- 1997 *Genesis.* Translated by M.E. Biddle. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Haas, V., and H.J. Thiel

- 1979 'Ein Beitrag zum Hurritischen Wörterbuch'. *UF* 11: 337-52.

Habel, N.C.

- 1964 *Yahweh versus Baal: A Conflict of Religious Cultures.* Graduate Study 6. New York: Bookman Associates.
- 1985 *The Book of Job: A Commentary.* OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Handy, L.K.

- 1990 'Dissenting Deities or Obedient Angels: Divine Hierarchies in Ugarit and the Bible'. *BR* 35: 18-35.
- 1994 *Among the Host of Heaven: The Syro-Palestinian Pantheon as Bureaucracy.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

- Haran, M.
 1972 'The Graded Numerical Sequence and the Phenomenon of "Automatism" in Biblical Poetry'. In *Congress Volume: Uppsala 1971*. Edited by G.W. Anderson, et. al. VTSup 22. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 238-67.
 1978 *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Harrison, J.
 1955 *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1922¹.
- Hartley, J.E.
 1988 *The Book of Job*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Hava, J.G.
 1964 *Al-Faraid Arabic-English Dictionary*. Beirut: Catholic Press.
- Healey, J.F.
 1978 'Ritual Text KTU 1.161 – Translation and Notes'. *UF* 10: 83-8.
 1979 'The Pietas of an Ideal Son in Ugarit'. *UF* 11: 353-6.
 1985 'The Akkadian pantheon list from Ugarit'. *SEL* 2: 115-25.
 1998 'The Kindly and Merciful God'. In Dietrich-Kottsieper (1998). 349-56.
- Heidel, A.
 1963 *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago press. 1946¹.
- Heltzer, M.
 1976 *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
 1978 'The *rabba'um* in Mari and the *rpi(m)* in Ugarit'. *OLP* 9: 5-20.
- Hendel, R.S.
 1985 "'The Flame of the Whirling Sword": A Note on Genesis 3:24'. *JBL* 104: 671-4.
 1987a 'Of Demigods and the Deluge: Toward an Interpretation of Genesis 6: 1-4'. *JBL* 106: 13-26.

Haran, M.

- 1972 'The Graded Numerical Sequence and the Phenomenon of "Automatism" in Biblical Poetry'. In *Congress Volume: Uppsala 1971*. Edited by G.W. Anderson, et. al. VTSup 22. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 238-67.
- 1978 *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Harrison, J.

- 1955 *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1922¹.

Hartley, J.E.

- 1988 *The Book of Job*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Hava, J.G.

- 1964 *Al-Faraid Arabic-English Dictionary*. Beirut: Catholic Press.

Healey, J.F.

- 1978 'Ritual Text KTU 1.161 - Translation and Notes'. *UF* 10: 83-8.
- 1979 'The Pietas of an Ideal Son in Ugarit'. *UF* 11: 353-6.
- 1985 'The Akkadian pantheon list from Ugarit'. *SEL* 2: 115-25.
- 1998 'The Kindly and Merciful God'. In Dietrich-Kottsieper (1998). 349-56.

Heidel, A.

- 1963 *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago press. 1946¹.

Heltzer, M.

- 1976 *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- 1978 'The *rabba'um* in Mari and the *rpi(m)* in Ugarit'. *OLP* 9: 5-20.

Hendel, R.S.

- 1985 "'The Flame of the Whirling Sword": A Note on Genesis 3:24'. *JBL* 104: 671-4.
- 1987a 'Of Demigods and the Deluge: Toward an Interpretation of Genesis 6: 1-4'. *JBL* 106: 13-26.

- 1987b 'When the Sons of God Cavorted with the Daughters of Men'. *BRev* 3: 8-13, 37.

Herdner, A.

- 1974 See Caquot, Sznycer and Herdner (1974).
1978 'Nouveaux textes alphabétiques de Ras Shamra - XXIV^e campagne 1961'. *Ug* 7: 1-74.

Herrmann, W.

- 1960 'Die Göttersöhne'. *ZRGG* 12: 242-51.
1968 *Yariḥ und Nikkal und der Preis der Kutarāt-Göttinnen; Ein kultisch-magischer Text aus Ras Shamra*. BZAW 106. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hertzberg, H.W.

- 1964 *I & II Samuel; a Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM Press.

Hettema, T.L.

- 1989-90 "'That it be repeated": A Narrative Analysis of KTU 1.23'. *JEOL* 31: 77-94.

L'Heureux, C.E.

- 1974 'The Ugaritic and Biblical Rephaim'. *HTR* 67: 265-74.
1976 'The *yēlîdê hārāpā'* - A Cultic Association of Warriors'. *BASOR* 221: 83-5.
1979 *Rank among the Canaanite Gods: El, Ba'al and the Repha'im*. HSM 21. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
1983 *In and Out of Paradise*. New York: Paulist Press.

Holladay, W.L.

- 1993 *The Psalms through Three Thousand Years*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Hooke, S.H.

- 1938 *The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual*. SLBA 1935. London: Pub. For the British Academy by H. Milford, Oxford University Press.

Howard, D.M., Jr.

- 1997 *The Structure of Psalms 93-100*. BJSUC 5. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

- Huehnergard, J.
 1987 *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*. HSS 32. Atlanta, GA: Scholars.
 2000 *A Grammar of Akkadian*. HSS 45. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Huffman, H.B.
 1965 *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Hummel, H.D.
 1957 'Enclitic Mem in Early Northwest Semitic, Especially Hebrew'. *JBL* 76: 85-107.
- Husser, J.-M.
 1995 'Culte des ancêtres ou rites funéraires? A propos du "catalogue" des devoirs du fils (KTU 1.17: i-ii)'. *UF* 27 : 115-27.
 1996 'The Birth of a Hero: Form and Meaning of KTU 1.17 i-ii'. In Wyatt-Watson-Lloyd (1996). 85-98.
- Hvidberg, F.F.
 1962 *Weeping and Laughter in the Old Testament*. Translated and Edited in English by F. Løkkegaard. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Hyatt, J.P.
 1980 *Exodus*. NCB. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Irvin, D.
 1978 *Mytharion: The Comparison of Tales from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East*. AOAT 32. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker.
- Jacobsen, T.
 1943 'Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia'. *JNES* 2: 159-72.
- Jacquet, L.
 1977 *Les Psaumes et le coeur de l'homme*. Vol. 2. Gembloux, Belgium: Ducolot.

- Janowski, B.
 1991 'Keruben und Zion'. In *Ernten was man sät; Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by D.R. Daniels, et al. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag. 231-64.
- Jastrow, M.
 1898 *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*. HHR 2. Boston: Ginn & Company.
- Jenks, A.W.
 1977 *The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions*. SBLMS 22. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
- Jeremias, J.
 1965 *Theophanie: die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung*. WMANT 10. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins.
- Jirku, A.
 1962 *Kanaanäische Mythen und Epen aus Ras-Schamra-Ugarit*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
 1965 'Rapa'u, der Fürst der Rap'uma-Raphaim'. ZAW 77: 82-3.
 1966 *Der Mythos der Kanaanäer*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt.
- Johnson, A.R.
 1967 *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Joines, K.R.
 1967 'Winged Serpents in Isaiah's Vision'. JBL 86: 410-5.
 1974 *Serpent Symbolism in the Old Testament: A Linguistic, Archaeological and Literary Study*. Haddonfield, NJ: Haddonfield House.
- Jones, G.H.
 1984 *1 and 2 Kings*. Vol. 2. NCBC. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.
- Joüon, Paul
 1923 *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

- 1939 'Les unions entre les "fills de Dieu" et les "filles des hommes" (Genèse, 6, 1-4)'. *RSR* 29: 108-14.

Jüngling, H-W.

- 1969 *Der Tod der Götter: eine Untersuchung zu Psalm 82*. SBS 38. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Kaiser, O.

- 1962 *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel*. 2nd ed. BZAW 78. Berlin: A. Töpelmann. 1959¹.

Kapelrud, A.S.

- 1952 *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts*. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad.
1969 'Baal and the Devourers'. *Ug* 6: 319-32.

Kautzsch, E.

- 1886 'Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Namens *yhw h z(s)b³wt'*. *ZAW* 6: 17-22.
1910 *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch. Translated by A.E. Cowley. 2nd English ed. Rev. in accordance with the 28th German ed. (1909). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Keel, O.

- 1977 *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst: Eine neue Deutung der Majestätsschilderungen in Jes 6, Ez 1 und 10 und Sach 4: Mit einem Beitrag von A. Gutbub über die vier Winde in Ägypten*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.
1978 *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. Translated by T.J. Hallett. London: SPCK.
1982 *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel*. Zürich: Benziger; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Keel, O. and C. Uehlinger

- 1998 *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel*. Translated by T.H. Trapp. Minneapolis: Fortress.

- Keil, C.F.
 1876 *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Ezekiel*. Vol. 1. CFTL; 4th Series. Translated by J. Martin. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark. Grand Rapids.
- Kissane, E.J.
 1941 *The Book of Isaiah, Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary*. Dublin: Browne and Nolan.
 1964 *The Book of Psalms, Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with a Commentary*. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Richview Press.
- Klein, R.W.
 1974 *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: the Septuagint after Qumran*. PA: Fortress Press.
- Kline, M.G.
 1962 'Divine Kingship and Genesis 6:1-4'. *WTJ* 24: 187-204.
 2000 *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis foundations for a Covenantal Worldview*. Overland Park, KS: Two Age Press. Repr.; South Hamilton, MA: M.G. Kline. 1981.
- Kloos, C.
 1986 *Yhwh's Combat with the Sea*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Kluger, R.S.
 1967 *Satan in the Old Testament*. Translated by H. Nagel. Leiden: E.J. Brill. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Knierim, R.
 1968 'The Vocation of Isaiah'. *VT* 18: 47-68.
- Korpel, M.C.A.
 1990 *A Rift in the Clouds*. UBL 9. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
 1996 'Avian Spirits in Ugarit and in Ezekiel 13'. In Wyatt-Watson-Lloyd (1996). 99-113.
- Kosmala, H.
 1968 'The Term *geber* in the Old Testament and in the Scrolls'. *VTSup* 17: 159-69.
 1975 'גבר'. *TDOT* 2: 367-82.

- Kraus, H.-J.
 1988-9 *Psalms*. 2 vols. Translated by H.C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Kruger, P.A.
 1989 'On non-verbal communication in the Baal epic'. *JS* 1/1: 54-69.
 1995 'Rank Symbolism in the Baal Epic'. *UF* 27: 169-75.
- Kutler, L.
 1984 'A "Strong" Case for Hebrew MAR'. *UF* 16: 111-8.
- Lacheman, E.R.
 1954 'Apropos Isaiah 7:14'. *JBR* 22: 42.
 1968 'The Seraphim of Isaiah 6'. *JQR* 59: 71-2.
- Laessøe, J.
 1959 *The Shemshara Tablets, a Preliminary Report*. København: I Kommission hos Munksgaard.
- Lambdin, T.O.
 1971 *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lambert, W.G.
 1960 *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Landsberger, B.
 1955 'Remarks on the Archive of the Soldier Ubarum'. *JCS* 9: 121-31.
- Landsberger, F.
 1947 'The Origin of the winged Angel in Jewish Art'. *HUCA* 20: 227-54.
- Layton, S.
 1986 'Biblical Hebrew "To Set the Face," in Light of Akkadian and Ugaritic'. *UF* 16: 169-81.
- Leslau, W.
 1966 'The Origin of Geez 'AWĀDI "Herald"'. *JSS* 11: 226-7

- 1987 *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic): Ge'ez-English/English-Ge'ez with an Index of the Semitic Roots*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Leslie, E.A.
1949 *The Psalms, Translated and Interpreted in the Light of Hebrew Life and Worship*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.
- Lewis, T.J.
1996 'Toward a Literary Translation of the Rapiuma Texts'. In Wyatt-Watson-Lloyd (1996). 115-49.
- Lind, M.C.
1980 *Yahweh is a Warrior: The Theology of Warfare in Ancient Israel*. Scottdale: Herald Press.
- Lindenberger, J.M.
1982 'The Gods of Ahiqar'. *UF* 14: 105-17.
- Lipiński, É.
1965 *La Royauté de Yahwé dans la Poésie et le culte de L'Ancien Israel*. Brussel: Paleis der Academiën.
1967a *Le poème royal du Psaume LXXXIX 1-5, 20-38*. Paris: J. Gabalda.
1967b 'Judges 5,4-5 et Psaume 68,8-11'. *Bib* 48: 185-206.
1970 'Banquet en l'honneur de Baal: CTA 3 (V AB), A, 4-22'. *UF* 2: 75-88.
1988 'Éa, Kothar et El'. *UF* 20: 137-43.
- Lloyd, J.B.
1994 *The Goddess Anat: An Examination of the Textual and Iconographic Evidence from the Second Millennium BC*. Ph.D. Diss. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Loewenstamm, S.E.
1959 'The Muzzling of the Tannin in the Ugaritic Myth'. *IEJ* 9: 260-1.
1967 'Prostration from Afar in Ugaritic, Accadian and Hebrew'. *BASOR* 188: 41-3.
1969 'Ugaritic Formulas of Greeting'. *BASOR* 194: 52-4.
1980 *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures*. AOAT 204. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker.

Loretz, O.

- 1967 'Götter und Frauen (Gen 6,1-4). Ein Paradigma zu: Altes Testament - Ugarit'. *BibLeb* 8: 120-7.
- 1968 *Schöpfung und Mythos: Mensch und Welt nach den Anfangskapiteln der Genesis*. SBS 32. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- 1971 'Psalmenstudien; III, Eine kanaanäische Short Story: Ps 82'. *UF* 3: 113-5.
- 1974 'Psalmen Studien III'. *UF* 6: 125-210.
- 1975 'Aspekte der kanaanäischen Gottes-So(/ö)hn(e)-Tradition im Alten Testament'. *UF* 7: 586-9.
- 1988 *Ugarit-Texte und Thronbesteigungspsalmen*. UBL 7. Munster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Macdonald, J.

- 1979 'An Assembly at Ugarit?'. *UF* 11: 515-26.

Macholz, C.

- 1980 'Psalm 29 und I. Könige 19, Jahweh und Baals Theophanie'. In *Werden und Wirken des Alten Testaments: Festschrift für C. Westerman*. Edited by R. Albertz, et al. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Neukirchen-Vluyn. 325-33.

Mandelkern, S.

- 1925 *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae*. Berlin: F. Margolin.

Mann, T.W.

- 1971 'The Pillar of Cloud in the Reed Sea Narrative'. *JBL* 90: 19-24.
- 1977 *Divine Presence and Guidance in Israelite Traditions: The Typology of Exaltation*. JHNES. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Margalit, B. (= B. Margulis)

- 1969 'Gen. XLIX 10/Deut. XXXIII 2-3'. *VT* 19: 202-10.
- 1970a 'The Canaanite Origin of Psalm 29 Reconsidered'. *Bib* 51: 332-48.
- 1970b 'An Ugaritic Psalm'. *JBL* 89: 292-304.
- 1976 'Studia Ugaritica II'. *UF* 8: 136-92.
- 1980 *A Matter of >Life< and >Death<: A Study of the Baal-Mot Epic (CTA 4-5-6)*. AOAT 206. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker.
- 1989a *The Ugaritic Poem of Aqht*. BZAW 182. Berlin: de Gruyter.

1989b 'Some Observations on the Inscription and Drawing from Khirbet El-Qôm'. VT 39: 371-8.

1995 'K-R-T Studies'. UF 27: 213-315.

Margulis, B.

See under B. Margalit.

Mayes, A.D.H.

1979 *Deuteronomy*. NCB. London: Oliphants.

Meier, S.A.

1988 *The Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World*. HSM 45. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

1992 *Speaking of Speaking: Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible*. VTSup 46. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

1999 'Angel I מלאך'. DDD: 45-50.

Mendenhall, G.E.

1973 *The Tenth Generation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mensching, G.

1958 *Die Söhne Gottes: Aus den heiligen Schriften der Menschheit*. Wien: Desch.

Mettinger, T.N.D.

1982 *The Dethronement of Sabaoth; Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. Translated by F.H. Cryer. ConBOTS 18. Lund: Gleerup.

1999a 'Cherubim כְּרוּבִים'. DDD: 189-92.

1999b 'Seraphim שְׂרָפִים'. DDD: 742-4.

1999c 'Yahweh Zebaoth יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת'. DDD: 920-4.

Metzger, M.

1985 *Königsthron und Gottesthron: Thronformen und Throndarstellungen in Ägypten und im Vorderen Orient im dritten und zweiten Jahrtausend vor Christus und deren Bedeutung für das Verständnis von Aussagen über den Thron im Alten Testament*. AOAT 15. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Meyer, R.

- 1961 'Die Bedeutung von Deuteronomium 32, 8f. 43 (4D) für die Auslegung des Mosesliedes'. In *Verbannung und Heimkehr: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie Israels im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Wilhelm Rudolph zum 70. Geburtstage*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr. 197-209.

Milik, J.T.

- 1957 'Deux document inédits de Désert de Juda'. *Bib* 38: 264-8.

Miller, P.D.

- 1965 'Fire in the Mythology of Canaan and Israel'. *CBQ* 27: 256-61.
1964 'Two Critical Notes on Psalm 68 and Deuteronomy 33'. *HTR* 57: 240-3.
1970a 'Ugaritic *ǵzr* and Hebrew *ʿzr* II'. *UF* 2: 159-75.
1970b 'Animal Names as Designations in Ugaritic and Hebrew'. *UF* 2: 177-86.
1973 *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*. HSM 5. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
1986 *Interpreting the Psalms*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Miller, J.M., and G.M. Tucker

- 1974 *The Book of Joshua*. CBC. London, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moor, J.C. de

- 1969 'Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra I'. *UF* 1: 167-88.
1970 'The Semitic Pantheon of Ugarit'. *UF* 2: 187-228.
1971 *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Poem of Baʿlu according to the Version of Ilimilku*. AOAT 16. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker.
1972 *New Year with Canaanites and Israelites*. 2 vols. Kampen: J.H. Kok.
1976 'Rapiuma-Rephaim'. *ZAW* 88: 323-45.
1979 'Contributions to the Ugaritic Lexicon'. *UF* 11: 639-53.
1980a 'El the Creator'. In Rendsburg-Adler-Arfa-Winter (1980). 171-87.
1980b 'An Incantation against Infertility (KTU 1.13)'. *UF* 12: 305-10.
1980c 'An Incantation against Evil Spirits (Ras Ibn Hani 78/20)'. *UF* 12: 429-32.
1981-2 'Demons in Canaan'. *JEOL* 27: 106-19.

- 1987 *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit*. Nisaba 16. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- 1988 'The Seasonal Pattern in the Legend of Aqhatu'. *SEL* 5: 61-78.
- 1990 *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*. BETL 91. Leuven: Peeters.
- 1997 *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*. 2nd ed. BETL 91. Leuven: Peeters. 1990¹.
- de Moor, J.C., and K. Spronk
- 1982a 'Problematic Passages in the Legend of Kirtu (I)'. *UF* 14: 153-71.
- 1982b 'Problematic Passages in the Legend of Kirtu (II)'. *UF* 14: 173-90.
- 1984 'More on Demons in Ugarit'. *UF* 16: 237-50.
- 1987 *A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit*. SSS NS 6. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Moore, G.F.
- 1895 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*. ICC. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
- Morgenstern, J.
- 1914 'Biblical Theophanies'. *ZA* 28: 15-60.
- 1939 'The Mythological Background of Psalm 82'. *HUCA* 14: 29-126.
- Moscatti, S. (ed.)
- 1964 *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages: Phonology and Morphology*. PLO 6. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz.
- Mowinckel, S.
- 1942 'Til uttrykket "Jahvaes tjener". Streiflys fra Ugarit II'. *NTT* 43: 24-6.
- 1962 *The Psalm in Israel's Worship*. 2 vols. Translated by Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mullen, E.T.
- 1980 *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature*. HSM 24. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- 1992 'Divine Assembly'. *ABD* 1: 214-7.
- Müller, H.-P.
- 1997 'קהל qāhāl assembly'. *TLOT* 2: 1118-26.

Murphy, J.G.

- 1875 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*.
Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.

Murtonen, A.

- 1953 'The Fixation in Writing of Various Parts of the Pentateuch'. *VT*
3: 46-53.

Neuberg, F.J.

- 1950 'An Unrecognized Meaning of Hebrew *DÔR*'. *JNES* 9: 215-7.

Newman, R.C.

- 1984 'The Ancient Exegesis of Genesis 6:2, 4'. *GTJ* 5: 13-36.

Newsom, C.A.

- 1992 'Angels'. *ABD* 1: 248-53.

Niehaus, J.J.

- 1995 *God at Sinai: Covenant and Theophany in the Bible and Ancient Near East*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Niehr, H.

- 1986 *Herrschen und Richten: Die Wurzel špt im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*. FB 54. Würzburg: Echter Verlag.
1987 'Götter oder Menschen - eine falsche Alternative: Bemerkungen zu Ps 82'. *ZAW* 99: 94-8.
1990 *Der Höchste Gott*. BZAW 190. Berlin: de Gruyter.
1999 'Host of Heaven *הַשָּׁמַיִם צֶבֶא*'. *DDD*: 428-30.

Noth, M.

- 1962 *Exodus*. Translated by J.S. Bowden. OTL. London: SCM Press.
1967 'The Holy Ones of the Most High'. In *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*. idem. Translated by D.R. Ap-Thomas. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Nougayrol, J.

- 1955 *Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales: PRU*
3. MRS 6. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
1956 *Textes accadiens des archives sud: PRU* 4. MRS 9. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

- 1965 *Textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives sud, sud-ouest et du petit palais: PRU 5. MRS 11. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.*
- 1968 'Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit'. *Ug* 5: 1-367.
- 1969 'La Lamaštu à Ugarit'. *Ug* 6: 393-408.
- 1970 *Textes en cunéiformes babyloniens des archives du grand palais et du palais sud d'Ugarit: PRU 6. MRS 12. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.*
- Nyberg, H.S.
- 1938 'Deuteronomium 33: 203'. *ZDMG* 92: 320-45.
- Obermann, J.
- 1946 *How Daniel Was Blessed With a Son: An Incubation Scene in Ugaritic. PAOSOS 20. New Haven: American Oriental Society.*
- 1948 *Ugaritic Mythology: A Study of Its Leading Motifs. New Haven: Yale University Press.*
- O'Callaghan, R.T.
- 1952 'The Word *ktp* in Ugaritic and Egypto-Canaanite Mythology'. *Or* 21: 37-46.
- 1953 'A Note on the Canaanite Background of Psalm 82'. *CBQ* 15: 311-4.
- 1954 'Echoes of Canaanite Literature in the Psalms'. *VT* 4: 164-76.
- O'Connor, M.
- 1977 'The Rhetoric of the Kilamuwa Inscription'. *BASOR* 226: 15-29.
- Oldenburg, U.
- 1969 *The Conflict between El and Ba'al in Canaanite Religion. Numen Supplements second series 3. Leiden: E.J. Brill.*
- Olmo Lete, G. del
- 1978 'Notes on Ugaritic Semantics IV'. *UF* 10: 37-46.
- 1981 *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan: según la tradición de Ugarit. Fuentes de la Ciencia Bíblica 1. Madrid: Eds. Cristianidad.*
- 1982 'Notes on Ugaritic Semantics V'. *UF* 14: 55-69.
- 1984a 'Antecedentes cananeos (ugaríticos) de formas literarias hebreo-bíblicas'. In Fernández Marcos, N., J. Trebolle Barrera, and J. Fernández Vallina (1984). 111-4.
- 1984b *Interpretación de la mitología cananea. Fuentes de la Ciencia Bíblica 2. Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo.*

- 1999 *Canaanite Religion According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit*.
Translated by W.G.E. Watson. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press.
- del Olmo Lete, G., and J. Sanmartín (eds.)
2004 *Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*.
Edited and Translated by W.G.E. Watson. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill.
2003¹.
- L'Orange, H.P.
1953 *Studies in the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World*.
Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Pardee, D.
1976 'The Preposition in Ugaritic'. *UF* 8: 215-322.
1977 'A New Ugaritic Letter'. *BO* 34: 3-20.
1978a 'The Semitic Root *mrr* and the Etymology of Ugaritic *mr(r)* ||
brk'. *UF* 10: 249-88.
1978b 'YPH "Witness" in Hebrew and Ugaritic'. *VT* 28: 204-13.
1989-90 'Ugaritic Proper Names'. *AfO* 36-37: 390-513.
1992 'Ugarit'. *ABD* 6: 695-721.
1997 'West Semitic Canonical Compositions'. In *The Context of
Scripture I: Canonical Compositions of the Biblical World*. Edited by
W.W. Hallo with J.L. Younger Jr. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 239-375.
1999 'Kosharoth כְּשָׁרוֹת'. *DDD*: 491-2.
2000 *Les Textes Rituels*. 2 vols. RS-O 12. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur
les Civilisations.
- Parker, S.B.
1970 'The Feast of Rapi'u'. *UF* 2: 243-9.
1972 'The Ugaritic Deity Rāpī'u'. *UF* 4: 97-102.
1995 'The Beginning of the Reign of God – Psalm 82 as Myth and
Liturgy'. *RB* 102: 532-59.
1999a 'Council סֹד'. *DDD*: 204-8.
1999b 'Saints קְדוּשִׁים'. *DDD*: 718-20.
1999c 'Sons of (the) God(s) בְּנֵי עֲלִיּוֹן / אֱלֹהִים / אֱלֹהִים'. *DDD*: 794-800.
- Parker, S.B. (ed.)
1997 *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. SBLWAW 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Pedersen, J.
1939 'Canaanite and Israelite Cultus'. *AcOr* 18: 1-14.

Perrot, G., and C. Chippiez

1882-1914 *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité: Égypte, Assyrie, Perse, Asie Mineure, Grèce, Étrurie, Rome*. 10 vols. Paris: Hachette et Cie.

Peterson, D.L., and M. Woodward

1977 'Northwest Semitic Religion: A Study in Relational Structures', *UF* 9: 233-48.

Phythian-Adams, W.J.

1923 'On the Date of the 'Blessing of Moses'. *JPOS* 3: 158-66.

Porada, Edith. (ed.)

1948 *Corpus of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in North American Collections*. Vol. 1. The collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Porteous, N.W.

1965 *Daniel: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Porter, J.R.

1978 'The Daughters of Lot'. *Folklore* 89: 127-41.

Pope, M.H.

1955 *El in the Ugaritic Texts*. VTSup 2. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

1965a 'Baal-Hadad'. In *WdM* 2: 253-64.

1965b 'Gapn und Ugar'. In *WdM* 2: 284-5.

1965c 'Qdš-w-Amrr'. In *WdM* 2: 304.

1972 'A Divine Banquet at Ugarit'. In *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of W.F. Stinespring*. Edited by J.M. Efrid. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 170-203.

1973 *Job*. AB 15. 3rd ed. Garden City, NY: Doubleday. 1965¹.

1977 'Notes on the Rephaim texts from Ugarit'. *MCAAS* 19: 163-82.

Pope, M.H. and W. Röllig

1965a 'Horon'. In *WdM* 2: 288-9.

1965b 'Rešep'. In *WdM* 2: 305-6.

Donat Poulet, O.M.I.

1942 'The Moral Causes of the Flood'. *CBQ* 4: 293-303.

- Preuss, H.D.
 1971 *Verspottung fremder Religionen im Alten Testament*. BWANT 92. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Pudor, H.
 1905 *Babel-Bibel in der modernen Kunst*. Berlin: Otto Baumgärtel.
- Rad, G. von
 1962 *Old Testament Theology*. Vol. 1. OTL. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. New York: Harper Collins.
 1964 'מִלְאָךְ in the OT'. TDNT 1: 76-80.
 1972 *Genesis: A Commentary*. OTL. Rev. ed. Translated by J.H. Marks. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Rainey, A.
 1969 'The Scribe at Ugarit: His Position and Influence'. *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences Humanities*. Vol. 3. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. 126-47.
- Rendsburg, G., R. Adler, M. Arfa, and N.H. Winter (eds.)
 1980 *The Bible World: Essays in Honor of Cyrus H. Gordon*. New York: Ktav Pub. House and the Institute of Hebrew Culture and Education of New York University.
- Renfroe, F.
 1992 *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies*. ALASP 5. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Rin, S.
 1968 *Alilot ha-elim: kol shirot Ugarit/ metro'atakot meshukhtavot u-meforashot; Acts of the Gods: The Ugaritic Epic Poetry; Translated, Transcribed and Interpreted. With Collaboration of S. Rin*. Jerusalem: Israel Society for Biblical Research.
- Ringgren, H.
 1947 *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the hypostatization of divine qualities and functions in the ancient Near East*. Lund: H. Ohlssons boktr.
 1974 'אלהים'. TDOT 1: 267-84.
 1977 'The Impact of the Ancient Near East on Israelite Tradition'. In *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*. Edited by D.A. Knight. London: SPCK. 31-46.

Robinson, H.W.

- 1944 'The Council of Yahweh'. *JTS* 45: 151-7.

Rofé, A.

- 1969 *ha-Emunah bi-mel'akchim be-Yiśra'el bi-teḳkufat bayit rishon le-or masorot Mikra'iyot* (Heb.). *Israelite Belief in Angels in Pre-exilic Period as Evidenced by Biblical Traditions* (Eng. Title). Ph.D. Diss. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Rose, M.

- 1992 'Names of God in the OT'. *ABD* 4: 1001-11.

Roth, W.M.W.

- 1962 'The numerical sequence $x/x + 1$ in the Old Testament'. *VT* 12: 300-11.

Rouillard, H.

- 1999 'Rephaim רפאים'. *DDD*: 692-700.

Rowley, H.H.

- 1967 *Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning*. London: S.P.C.K.
1970 *Job*. NCB. London: Nelson.

Rüterswörden, U.

- 1999 'Horon הורן'. *DDD*: 425-6.

Ryan, D.J.

- 1954 *Rpum and Rephaim: A Study in the Relationship between the Rpum of Ugarit and the Rephaim of the Old Testament*. M.A. Thesis. National University of Ireland.

Salters, R.B.

- 1991 'Psalm 82, 1 and the Septuagint'. *ZAW* 103: 225-39.

Sanmartín, J.

- 1971 'Notizen zur ugaritischen orthographie'. *UF* 3: 173-80.
1973 'Semantisches über ḥmr "sehen" und ḥmr "sagen" im Ugaritischen'. *UF* 5: 263-70.
1978 'Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon (II)'. *UF* 10: 349-56.

- 1980 'Zu den 'ad(d)-Denominierungen im Ugaritischen'. *UF* 12: 345-8.
- 1991 'Isoglosas morfológicas eblaítico-ugaríticas: la trampa lexicográfica'. *AuOr* 9: 165-217.
- Sarna, N.M.
- 1989 *Genesis*. JPSTC. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- 1991 *Exodus*. JPSTC. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- de Savignac, J.
- 1972 'Les "Seraphim"'. *VT* 22: 320-5.
- Schaeffer, C.F.-A.
- 1933 'Les fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras Shamra, 4^e campagne (printemps 1932), rapport sommaire'. *Syria* 14: 93-127.
- 1937 'Les fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit, 8^e campagne (printemps 1936), rapport sommaire'. *Syria* 18: 125-54.
- 1949 'La grande stèle du Baal au foudre de Ras Shamra'. *Ug* 2: 121-34.
- Schaeffer, C.F.-A., and W. Forrer
- 1983 *Corpus des Cylindre-sceaux de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et d'Enkomi-Alasia* 1. Synthèse 13. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Scharbert, J.
- 1977 'ברך *brk*'. *TDOT* 2: 279-308.
- Schedl, C.
- 1964 'Psalm 8 in Ugaritischer Licht'. *FuF* 38: 183-5.
- Schlisske, W.
- 1973 *Gottessöhne und Gottessohn im Alten Testament: Phasen der Entmythisierung im Alten Testament*. BWANT 97. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Schnutenhaus, F.
- 1964 'Das Kommen und Erscheinen Gottes im Alten Testament'. *ZAW* 76: 1-22.
- Schmid, H.
- 1955 'Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem'. *ZAW* 67: 168-97.

Schmidt, H.

- 1934 *Die Psalmen*. HAT 1; Reihe 15. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Schmidt, W.H.

- 1966 *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel*. 2 ed. BZAW 80. Berlin: Töpelmann. 1961¹.
1967 'Mythos im Alten Testament'. *EvT* 27: 237-54.
1997a 'אלהים ^{el}lōhîm God'. *TLOT* 1: 115-26.
1997b 'קנה qnh to acquire'. *TLOT* 3: 1147-53.

Schoors, A.

- 1972 'Literary Phrases'. *RSP* 1: 3-70.

Scroggie, G.

- 1978 *The Psalms*. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming and Revell Company.

Seeligmann, I.L.

- 1964 'A Psalm from Pre-Regal Times'. *VT* 14: 75-92.

Segal, J.B.

- 1958 'An Aramaic Ostrakon From Nimrud'. *Iraq* 19: 139-45.

Segert, S.

- 1997 *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Selms, A. van

- 1954 *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature*. POS 1. London: Luzac & Company.
1970 'Yammu's Dethronement by Baal'. *UF* 2: 251-72.
1979 'The Root *k-t-r* and Its Derivatives in Ugaritic Literature'. *UF* 11: 739-44.

Seybold, K.

- 1990 *Introducing the Psalms*. Translated by R.G. Dunphy. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Skinner, J.

- 1910 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. ICC. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.

- Simons, J.
1959 *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Sivan, D.
2001 *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*. 2nd ed. HdO 28. Abt. 1. NME. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Slotki, I.W.
1949 *Isaiah*. London: Soncino Press.
- Smend, R.
1970 *Yahweh's War and Tribal Confederation*. Translated by M. Rogers. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Smith, G.A.
1918 *The Book of Deuteronomy*. CBSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, M.S.
1984 'Divine Travel as a Token of Divine Rank'. *UF* 16: 359.
1985 *Kothar wa-Hasis, the Ugaritic Craftsman God*. Ph.D. Diss. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
1986 'Mt. Il in KTU 1.2 i 19-10'. *UF* 18: 458.
1992 'Rephaim'. *ABD* 1: 674-6.
1994 *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*. Vol. 1: *Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2*. VTSup 55. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
1997 'The Baal Cycle'. In Parker 1997: 81-180.
2002 *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; Dearborn, MI: Dove. 1990¹.
- Soggin, J.A.
1972 *Joshua: A Commentary*. Translated by R.A. Wilson. London: SCM Press.
1981 *Judges: A Commentary*. OTL. Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Speiser, E.A.
1964 *Genesis*. AB 1. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday.

- Strahan, J.
1914 *The Book of Job*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark. 1913¹.
- Tallqvist, K.L.
1938 *Akkadische Götterepitheta, mit einem Göttererzeichnis und einer Liste der prädikativen Elemente der sumerischen Götternamen*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica.
- de Tarragon, J.-M.
1989 'Les rituels'. In Caquot, de Tarragon and Cunchillos (1989). 125-238.
- Tate, M.E.
1990 *Psalms 51-100*. WBC 20. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Thieme, P.
1960 'The "Aryan" gods of the Mitanni Treaties'. *JAOS* 80: 301-17.
- Thomas, D.W.
1934 'Mitteilungen: The root שנה = سنى in Hebrew'. *ZAW* 52: 236-8.
- van der Toorn, K.
1991 'Funerary Rituals and Beatific Afterlife in Ugaritic Texts and the Bible'. *BO* 48: 40-66.
- Tournay, R.-J.
1949 'The Psaumes complexes (suite) (1)'. *RB* 56: 37-60.
- Tropper, J.
2000 *Ugaritische Grammatik*. AOAT 273. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Tsevat, M.
1955 *A Study of the Language of the Biblical Psalms*. JBLMS 9. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature.
1969 'God and the Gods in Assembly: An Interpretation of Psalm 82'. *HUCA* 40: 123-37.
1971 'Traces of Hittite at the Beginning of the Ugaritic Epic of Aqht'. *UF* 3: 351-2.
- Tsumura, D.
1978 'A Problem of Myth and Ritual Relationship – CTA 23 (UT 52): 56-57 reconsidered'. *UF* 10: 387-95.

Tur-Sinai, N.H.

- 1957 *The Book of Job: A New Commentary*. Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher.

de Vaux, R.

- 1960-1 'Les Chérubins et l'arche d'alliance les sphinxs gardiens et les trones divins dans l'Ancient Orient'. *MUSJ* 37: 93-124.
1961 *Ancient Israel : Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by J. McHugh. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.

Vawter, B.

- 1952 'The Ugaritic Use of *ḡlmt'*. *CBQ* 14: 319-22.

Vermeylen, J.

- 1986 *Job, ses amis et son dieu*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Vita, J.-P.

- 1996 'La herramienta *katinnu* en el texto de Ugarit RS 19.23'. *Sefarad* 56: 439-43.

Vita, J.-P. and W.G.E. Watson

- 2002 'Are the Akk. terms *katappu* (Ug. *ktp*) and *katinnu* Hurrian in Origin?'. *AoF* 29: 146-9.

Virolleaud, C.

- 1931 'Un poème phénicien de Ras-Shamra; La lutte de Môt, fils des dieux et d'Aleïn, fils de Baal'. *Syria* 12: 193-244.
1932 'Un nouveau chant du poème d'Aleïn-Baal'. *Syria* 13: 113-63.
1933 'La naissance des dieux gracieux et beaux. Poème Phénicien de Ras-Shamra'. *Syria* 14 : 128-51.
1936 *La légende phénicienne de Danel*. BAH 21; MRS 2. Paris : Geuthner.
1938 *La déesse Anat*. BAH 28; MRS 4. Paris: Geuthner.
1940 'Les Rephaim'. *RES* 7: 77-83.
1942-3 'Le mariage du Roi Keret (III K). Poème de Ras Shamra'. *Syria* 23: 137-72.
1968 'Les nouveaux textes mythologiques et liturgiques de Ras Shamra (xxiv^e campagne, 1961)'. *Ug* 5: 545-606.

Vogt, E.

- 1979 'Die vier "Gesichter" (*panim*) der Keruben in Ez.' *Bib* 60: 327-47.

- Vries, S.J. de
 1978 *Prophet against Prophet: the Role of the Michiah Narrative (1 Kings 22) in the Development of Early Prophetic Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Walls, N.H.
 1992 *The Goddess Anat in Ugaritic Myth*. SBLDS 135. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Waltke, B.K., and M. O'Connor
 1990 *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Ward, J.M.
 1961 'The Literary Form and Liturgical Background of Psalm LXXXIX'. VT 11: 321-39.
- Ward, W.A.
 1961 'Comparative Studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic'. JNES 20: 31-40.
 1968 'The Four-winged Serpent in Hebrew Seals'. RSO 43: 135-43.
- Watson, W.G.E.
 1976a 'Ugarit and the OT: Further Parallels'. Or 45: 434-42.
 1976b 'Puzzling Passages in the Tale of Aqhat'. UF 8: 371-8.
 1977 'Ugaritic and Mesopotamian Literary Texts'. UF 9: 273-84.
 1978 'Parallels to Some Passages in Ugaritic'. UF 10: 397-401.
 1981 'Reversed Word-Pairs in Ugaritic Poetry'. UF 13: 189-92.
 1983 'The Character of Ugaritic Poetry'. JNSL 11: 157-69.
 1984 *Classical Hebrew Poetry*. JSOTSup 26. Sheffield.
 1986 'Unravelling Ugaritic *mdl'*. SEL 3: 73-8.
 1992 'Final *-m* in Ugaritic'. AuOr 10: 223-52.
 1993 '*Atrt ym*: Yet Another Proposal'. UF 25: 431-4.
 1994a 'Aspects of Style in KTU 1.23'. SEL 11: 3-8.
 1994b 'Comments on Ugaritic *wn'*. AuOr 12: 229-32.
 1995 'Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon'. UF 27: 533-58.
 1996 'Comments on Some Ugaritic Lexical Items'. JNSL 22: 73-84.
 1998 'Delimiting Ugaritic *thm*: A Brief Report'. UF 30: 745-9.
 1999 'Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon (4)'. UF 31: 785-99.
 2000 'Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon (5)'. UF 32: 567-75.
- Watson, W.G.E., and N. Wyatt (eds.)
 1999 *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. HdO 39. Abt. 1. NME. Leiden: Brill.

- Weber, J.J.
1968 *Le Psautier*. Tournai/Paris: Desclée.
- Weiser, A.
1962 *The Psalms: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM Press.
- Wellhausen, J.
1898 *The Book of Psalms*. Translated by H.H. Furness, *et al.* SBONT 14. London: J. Clarke.
- Westermann, C.
1967 *Basic forms of Prophetic Speech*. Translated by H.C. White. Philadelphia: Westminster.
1984-6 *Genesis: A Commentary*. 3 vols. Translated by J.J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House.
- Wiggins, S.A.
1991 'The Myth of Asherah: Lion Lady and Serpent Goddess'. *UF* 23: 383-94.
1998 'What's in a Name? Yariḥ at Ugarit'. *UF* 30: 761-79.
- Woudstra, M.H.
1981 *The Book of Joshua*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Wright, G.E.
1941 'Solomon's Temple Resurrected'. *BA* 4: 24-8.
1950 *The Old Testament against Its Environment*. SBT 2. London: SCM Press.
1962 *Biblical Archaeology*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Wright, R.M.
1994 'Egyptian *np3p'*: A Cognate for Ugaritic *mpr* "Convulsion"'. *UF* 26: 539-41.
- Wulff, O.
1894 *Cherubim, Throne und Seraphim*. Altenburg: Druck von Oskar Bonde.
- Wyatt, N.
1977 'The Identity of Mt-w-Šr'. *UF* 9: 379-81.

- 1980 'The Relationship of the Deities Dagan and Hadad'. *UF* 12: 375-9.
- 1985a "'Araunah the Jebusite" and the Throne of David'. *ST* 39: 39-53.
- 1985b 'Killing and cosmogony in Canaanite and biblical thought'. *UF* 17: 373-81.
- 1986a 'The AB Cycle and Kingship in Ugaritic Thought'. *Cosmos* 2: 136-42.
- 1986b 'The Significance of the Burning Bush'. *VT* 36: 361-5.
- 1986c 'The Hollow Crown: Ambivalent Elements in West Semitic Royal Ideology'. *UF* 18: 421-36.
- 1987a 'Sea and Desert: Symbolic Geography in West Semitic Religious Thought'. *UF* 19: 375-89.
- 1987b 'Baal's Boars'. *UF* 19: 391-8.
- 1988 'The Source of the Ugaritic Myth of the Conflict of Ba'al and Yam'. *UF* 20: 375-85.
- 1989 'Quaternities in the Mythology of Baal'. *UF* 21: 451-59.
- 1990 'The Story of Dinah and Shechem'. *UF* 22: 433-58.
- 1992a 'The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm-God'. *UF* 24: 403-24.
- 1992b 'The Pruning of the Vine in KTU 1.23'. *UF* 24: 426-30.
- 1994a 'The meaning of El Roi and the mythological dimension of Genesis 16'. *SJOT* 8: 141-51.
- 1994b 'The Theogony Motif in Ugarit and the Bible'. In *Ugarit and the Bible*. G.J. Brooke, A.H.W. Curtis and J.F. Healey (eds.). UBL 11. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag. 395-419.
- 1995a 'The Significance of *špn* in West Semitic Thought: A Contribution to the History of a Mythological Motif'. In Dietrich-Loretz (eds.: 1995). 213-37.
- 1995b 'The Liturgical Context of Psalm 19 and its Mythical and Ritual Origins'. *UF* 27: 559-96.
- 1995c 'Le centre du Monde dans les littératures d'Ougarit et d'Israël'. *JNSL* 21: 123-42.
- 1996 *Myths of Power: A Study of Royal Myth and Ideology in Ugaritic and Biblical Tradition*. UBL 13. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- 1998a 'Arms and the King: The Earliest Allusions to the *Chaoskampf* Motif and their Implications for the Interpretation of the Ugaritic and Biblical Traditions'. In Dietrich-Kottsieper (1998). 833-82.
- 1998b 'Understanding Polytheism: Structure and Dynamic in a West Semitic Pantheon'. *JHC* 5: 24-63.
- 1999 'The Story of Aqhat (KTU 1.17-19)'. In Watson-Wyatt (1999). 234-58.

- 2001 *Space and Time in the Religious Life of the Ancient Near East*. BS 85. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- 2002 *Religious Texts from Ugarit*. 2nd ed. BS 53. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 1998¹.
- 2006 'A la recherche des Rephaïm perdus'. In *Le royaume d'Ougarit de la Crète à l'Euphrate. Nouveaux axes de recherche*. J.-M. Michaud (ed.). Collection POLO. Sherbrooke, QC: Éditions GGC. In Press.

Wyatt, N., W.G.E. Watson, and J.B. Lloyd (eds.)

- 1996 *Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Ugarit, religion and culture; Edinburgh, July 1994*. Essays presented in honour of Professor John C.L. Gibson. UBL 12. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Xella, P.

- 1973 *Il mito di ŠHR e ŠLM. Saggio sulla mitologia ugaritica*. SS 44. Rome: Centro di Studi Semitici.
- 1981 *I Testi Rituali di Ugarit - I*. SS 54. Rome: Istituto di Studi del Vicino Oriente.

Yamashita, T.

- 1975 'Professions' in RSP 2: 41-68.

Yon, M.

- 1991 'Les stèles de pierre'. In *Arts et industrie de la pierre*. RS-O 6. Directed by M. Yon, et al. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations; Lyon: Maison de l'Orient. 273-344.
- 1997 *La Cité d'Ougarit sur le tell de Ras Shamra*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Young, E.J.

- 1965 *The Book of Isaiah*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans.

Zenger, E.

- 1996 *A God of Vengeance?: Understanding the Psalms of Divine Wrath*. Translated by L.M. Maloney. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.

Zevit, Z.

- 1968 'The Structure and Individual Elements of Daniel 7'. ZAW 80: 385-96.

Van Zijl, P.J.

- 1972 *Baal: A Study of Texts in Connexion with Baal in the Ugaritic Epics*. AOAT 10. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker.

Zimmerli, W.

- 1979-83 *Ezekiel*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Translated by R.E. Clements (vol. 1) and J.D. Martin (vol. 2). Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Zobel, H.-J.

- 2003 'בַּאֲוֹרָה $\text{\$}^e\text{\textit{bā}'}\text{\textit{ôl}}$ '. TDOT 12: 215-32.